5

A Second LETTER TO Mr. *WILLIAM NEEDHAM*, IN ANSVVER TO THE Defence of the Preservative against Popery Written by Dr. *SHERLOCK'S SECOND*, *A Protestant Footman.*

by L. Sabran

WHEREIN

Dr. *Sherlock*'s Principles are Examined, and proved void of *Common Sense*, destructive of *Faith*, injurious to *Fathers*, *Councils*, and *Moral Honesty.*

With Allowance.

LONDON,

Printed by *Henry Hills*, Printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty, for His Houshold and Chappel; And are sold at his Printing-house on the Ditch-side in *Black-Fryers*. 1688.

Reader,

YOU *will find in the* Poſtſcript *an Anſwer to the* Preface *ſet before the* Defence; *which being a Heap of undigeſted Untruths, and ill-contriv'd Calumnies, I conceived it moſt proper to expoſe them: where I deſign to lay open a few of Dr.* Comber's many great Cheats, and diſingenuous Forgeries, *in his* Advice *to* Roman-Catholics. *Beſides, I thought my ſelf bound in Juſtice and good Manners to yield the Preference to the* Honeſt Footman, *whoſe Style is not near ſo* Lewd *and* Unmannerly *as the outragious* Preface-maker's, *who may with reaſon be ſuppoſed a* Miniſter, *that* CANONICAL GOWN *having theſe late Years been a conſtant* Sanctuary *to ſo many* Libelling, Slandering, Prophane, Reviling, Peeviſh *and* Uncharitable *Pens, that the greateſt part of thoſe Books which in any of theſe kinds have appeared of late Years in this Kingdom, have been the not-unnatural Iſſues of theſe* Meek, Charitable, Humble *and* Loyal Levites.

SIR,

THO' you have declared to ſome Friends, That you do not conceive your ſelf under any Obligation of Anſwering my firſt Letter, the Licenſing of a Book being (I perceive) but a Friendly Office, and a cheap one too, when Conſcience only and Reputation may be concern'd in it, and not obliging the Licenſer to boggle at any *Calumnies* he meets with in it, nor at any *Falſhood* that impoſes upon the Readers, tho' in a Concern of ſo high a nature as the True Faith and Eternal Salvation: However, I will tempt your good Nature and Civility once more, hoping that you may at leaſt make uſe of Dr. *Sherlock*'s happy Contrivance; and when you are ſenſible that Five or Six Weeks Endeavors cannot ſuggeſt any Anſwer that may appear to Public View, without betraying the weakneſs of your Cauſe, and the unwarrantable Methods us'd in its defence, you will find out ſome *Honeſt Footman*, who will not bluſh to own all the Wrong, and impertinent Reaſoning which muſt make up a ſeeming Anſwer.

I am confident, how unkindly ſoever you may deal with others, that you owe Dr. *Sherlock* ſo much Deference, as not to Licenſe a Book Printed in his Defence, without his Peruſal and Allowance. Wherefore not to trouble the Footman, *whoſe Circumſtances* (as we are told) *can expect but a ſmall allowance of time*, I ſhall look on the Anſwers given by Dr. *Sherlock*'s *Second*, as offered, or at leaſt owned by him, and Examin how he ſupports thoſe Principles by which I pretend that he overthrows, Firſt, *All right uſe of Common Senſe*.

It is a Catholic Principle, That he who has an Infallible Guide, need not miſtruſt him ſo, as to enquire farther, whether he be in the right Way, tho' he may and ought to improve himſelf in the knowledge of the Way he is directed in. Dr. *Sherlock*, in oppoſition to this ſelf-evident Principle, charges the Catholic Church with this great Crime, That *it will not allow the reading of Heretical Books*; adding, That *God* *Preſervat. Fol.* 3.

not only allows, but requires it. This ſeemed to me extravagant, not to ſay impious, and to all thoſe who have inherited from St. *Paul* that Faith to which he exacts ſo firm and unwavering
Gal. 1. 8. an adherency, that if an Angel from Heaven ſhould teach us any thing in oppoſition to it, we ought not to mind him, or to return him any other Anſwer than *Anathema*. How can, ſaid I, this poſitive Certainty ſtand with an Obligation of reading Heretical Books which oppoſe that Faith, to frame by them, and ſettle a Judgment? By what Text doth God deliver this Injunction? I asked farther, how ſtanding to the firſt Principles of *Common Senſe*, a Church that declares all Men bound *to Judge for themſelves*, could Countenance Laws which exact of *Diſſenters*, that they ſtand not to that their Judgment, but Comply againſt it; and that conſtrain their liberty of Judging by the dread of Excommunications, Sequeſtrations, Impriſonments, Excluſion from the chiefeſt Properties of free-born Subjects, even by Hanging and Quartering: which is to make it Death not to act againſt a ſtrict Duty of Conſcience, acknowledg'd by the Perſecutors to be ſuch. Theſe were three material Queſtions; I waited Six Weeks for an Anſwer, and he returns me at laſt by his Footman this wonderful one: *That I leave out what was ſaid of the Bible. Dr.* Sherlock *blaming the Church of* Rome, *for not ſuffering her People to diſpute their Religion, or to read Heretical Books, nay not ſo much as to look into the Bible it ſelf; that I take it for granted, that all the Writings of Proteſtant Divines are Heretical Books, nay the Bible it ſelf too.* I wonder not the Doctor ſhould give this his Anſwer by a Footman; he hath yet, I conceive, ſome remnants of Modeſty. But is there here one word of Anſwer to my three Queſtions? No, not a ſyllable, nor of Truth neither. I reflected on no Divines of any Perſuaſion; I found *Heretical Books* in the number of thoſe which he blames our Church for not recommending, and which he aſſures us God requires the reading of. This being an Objection of a new Coin, and a Proof of his own Invention, I ſhew'd the Unreaſonableneſs of the one, and asked an Inſtance of the other, paſſing by that trivial Calumny ſo often Anſwered, That *the Catholic Church ſuffers not her People to look into the Bible it ſelf*; which ſuppoſes that we lock up the Bible,

as

as the *Romans* did their *Sybillin Books*, whereas many thousands are commanded by the Catholic Church, setting aside all temporal Concerns, to make the reading of the Word of God their continual ſtudy, and to teach daily the Doctrin of it to thoſe who not having learnt to read, or being of too weak a Judgment to carry away the Senſe of a Book, or too much taken up by their Trades and Employs, by which they ſupport their Families, and earn themſelves a neceſſary Livelihood, have not the Leiſure or Capacity to gather the Articles of Chriſtian Belief, or the different Parts of Chriſtian Duties from it: for to all others, who conceive they may reap a Benefit from it, leave is never deny'd to read the Bible, tranſlated to that end into all vulgar Tongues.

In the cloſe an Anſwer is attempted, and the Author of the *Defence* tells me, *He is not content with an Implicit Faith; That we are commanded to try the Spirits, and to try all things.* Theſe are the Texts produc'd to maintain Dr. *Sherlock*'s three Poſitions, *That we are obliged to read Heretical Books, That God commands it, That each one is to judge finally for himſelf.* I offer the following Obſervations on theſe Texts to your ſecond thoughts.

With reaſon St. *Paul* commands each Chriſtian *to try all things, and to retain what is good:* And St. *John* in plainer terms, *Not to credit every Spirit, but to try the Spirits, if they be of God*; for, as St. *John* obſerves in that very place, *many falſe Prophets have appeared in the World:* And ſince *'tis neceſſary that Hereſies ariſe*, there will ever be many ſuch, *the Miniſters of Satan*, as St. *Paul* minds us, 2 *Cor.* 11. 15. *transfiguring themſelves like unto the Miniſters of Juſtice.* We ought not then to believe each Man that pretends to the pure Word of the Lord, to the Spirit of the Lord. The Queſtion is, How we ought to try theſe different Spirits? Each Man, ſays Dr. *Sherlock*, is to read all Heretical as well as Orthodox Books, to hear all Falſe Prophets as well as the Teachers of Truth, Each ignorant Tradeſman, Husbandman, Day-Laborer, having read the Bible, heard and read what the Diſſenting Divines can ſay, is to Decide as Sovereign Judge, without Appeal: All are to chooſe thus their Religion. Not ſo, ſays St. *Paul*; *On ſome only is beſtowed the Gift of Interpreting, on ſome*

Omnia probate, quod bonum eſt tenete. 1 *Theſ.* 5.

Nolite omni Spiritui credere, ſed probate Spiritus, ſi ex Deo ſunt. 1 *Joan.* 4.

Quoniam multi Pſeudo-Prophetæ exierunt in Mundum.

Alii Prophetia, alii diſcretio Spirituum. 1 *Cor.* 12. 29.

ſome only the Gift of diſcerning Spirits. A neceſſary Caution; for as St. *Cyprian* obſerves, *Hence ariſe all Hereſies, that People do not conſider that there is one Prieſt in the Church of God for the time, one Judge in lieu of Chriſt*; but challenge each of them the Prerogative of Judging for themſelves. *Heretics* (ſays Tertullian) *abandon the Church, repair to Schools of Philoſophy,* (or Natural Diſcourſe, and the Judgment of their Reaſon) *appeal to Common Senſe, but to their own, not to that of the Church.* They profeſs in their Creed to believe the Catholic Church, but as St. *Auguſtin* ſaid of the *Manicheans, All they endeavor is not to find what they believe*: and having left the School of Chriſt, and thoſe Teachers he had appointed them, they make good by their continual Debates about Religion, (without any fixure on a certain and unwavering Faith, without any ſecure Principles to build on) that Character which S. *Paul* gives of all Heretics, *They are ever ſeeking, ever learning, and never attain the ſcience of truth.* What is their Duty then, but to ſeek out thoſe to whom the infallible Direction of the Holy Ghoſt is promiſed by Chriſt our Lord, and accordingly given; ſo that they have Authority to reſolve all Doubts with a *The Holy Ghoſt declares this, and we declare it.* That no other Method can bring us to a ſteddy and unwavering Faith. St. *Paul* did acknowledge to the *Epheſians*, when having warned them *Epheſ.* 4. 3, 11. *To be careful to keep the unity of the ſpirit in the bond of peace*, he declares that *God gave ſome Apoſtles, and ſome Prophets, and ſome Evangeliſts, and other Paſtors and Doctors, to the conſummation of the Saints unto the work of the Miniſtry, unto the edifying of the Body of Chriſt*, and that not for ſome Age or Ages only, but *until we meet all unto the unity of Faith, and Knowledge of the Son of God, into a perfect Man, into the meaſure of the age of the fulneſs of Chriſt*; that is, to the laſt day of the General Reſurrection, this Method of ſtanding to the Deciſions of ſuch lawful Paſtors being neceſſary: *That we be not children, wavering, and carried about with every wind of Doctrin, in the wickedneſs of Men in craftineſs, to the circumvention of Error.* That this is the Senſe of the two Texts cited in oppoſition to it, is moſt evident from the very places whence they are taken; for St. *John* having adviſed Chriſtians *to try the Spirits*, gives this ſtanding Rule and Method for all Ages: *He*

Hinc Hæreſes ortæ quod unus in Eccleſia Dei ad tempus Sacerdos, & ad tempus Judex vice Chriſti non cogitatur. *l.* 1. *c.* 3. *cont. Hær.* De Eccleſia in Academiæ porticum deſcendunt, ſenſui communi ſed ſuo, non Eccleſiæ ſe ſiſtunt. *Contr. Hermog.* Nil laborant niſi non invenire quod credunt. *l.* 2. *c.* 2. *de Gen. con. Man.* Semper diſcunt & numquam ad ſcientiam veritatis perveniunt. 2 *Tim.* 3. Viſum eſt Spiritui Sancto & nobis. *Act.* 15.

He that knows God (by a true Faith,) *hears Us; he that is not of God, hears us not: By this Mark you ſhall diſcern the Spirit of truth from the ſpirit of error.* Behold St. *John* condemning Dr. *Sherlock*, who will have each Man Judge for himſelf of the Doctrin; whereas St. *John* declares we muſt try the Spirits only by this Mark, That they have the Spirit of God who hear with Submiſſion their lawful Paſtors, whereas thoſe who Judge for themſelves without that Deference, are certainly poſſeſſed with the Spirit of Error. 'Tis alſo evident, that by *US* he means all lawful Paſtors, and not the Apoſtles only; for they were all dead when he writ that Epiſtle. Could any Text be a fuller and more preſſing Evidence for me, or aſſure us more poſitively, that an unerring Spirit guides the Paſtors and Teachers in the Church of God; and that whoever will not fall into Error, muſt ſubmit by an *Implicit Faith* to that Churches Authority, and embrace the Doctrins which ſhe teaches by her Prelates. The other Text (ſo unhappy theſe Men are in their choice) is as full and plain to the ſame effect: for St. *Paul* having firſt warned the *Theſſalonians* in the foregoing Verſe, not to deſpiſe the Gift of Prophecy or Interpretation given to the Teachers of the Church for the Inſtruction of others, he bids them by this Text, not to receive all ſorts of Interpreters, but ſuch only as had received from the Holy Ghoſt the Gift of Propheſying, and were Commiſſioned by a lawful Authority to Preach: But ſo far he was from adviſing them to converſe with, or read the Books of thoſe that were Aliens and out of the Church, that he had warned before the *Epheſians, with caution to converſe with ſuch.* But let us obſerve the ſeveral Marks given by the Apoſtles and by Chriſt, whereby to diſtinguiſh thoſe who are to be admitted of, from thoſe who ought to be rejected. St. *Paul* gives the *Galatians* this Rule, *Whoever Preaches beſide what you have received, be he accurſed*; that's all the regard St. *Paul* bids us have for all ſuch Innovators, as pretend to a reformation of Faith, which, as *Tertullian* teaches, is not liable to any, becauſe 'tis not expoſed to the leaſt danger of failing, the Gates of Hell (Errors) not being permitted ever to prevail againſt the Church: which mov'd St. *Auguſtin* to declare thus his Senſe: *We are certain, that no one can divide himſelf from the Communion of all Nations*;

Qui novit Deum audit nos, qui non eſt ex Deo non audit nos: in hoc cognoſcimus Spiritum veritatis & ſpiritum erroris. 1 *Jo.* 4. 6.

In ſapientia ambulate cum iis qui foris ſunt. *Eph.* 4. 5.

Si quis Evangelizaverit præterquam id quod accepiſtis, anathema. *Gal.* 1.

Irreformabilis fides.

Certi ſumus neminem a communione gen-

for

tiam ſe ſeparare potuiſſe, nam non quiſque noſtrum in ſuâ juſtitiâ, ſed in ſcripturis ſacris quærit Eccleſiam, & ut promiſſa eſt reddi conſpicit. *Epiſt.* 48.

Dic Eccleſiæ, ſi Eccleſiam non audierit ſit tibi velut Ethnicus & Publicanus. *Matt.* 18.

for not any one amongſt us muſt ſeek the Church in his own Juſtice, (ſuch as his own private Judgment frames) *but in the Holy Scriptures, and he will find the Church, ſuch as ſhe is there promiſed.* What Mark did our Bleſſed Lord ſet? In whatever Offence received from a Brother, whatever Scandal (and there is not any greater than Hereſie and Schiſm) in *caſe he hearken not unto, obey not the Church, let him be to thee as a Heathen or a Publican*; that is, have no Converſe with him, ſeparate thy ſelf from him. Certainly this Advice of Chriſt is perfectly oppoſite to that Obligation Dr. *Sherlock* would impoſe on all. St. *Irenæus* who received the true meaning of Chriſt's Doctrin from St. *Polycarp*, St. *John*'s Diſciple, underſtood it in a very different meaning, when in his Fourth Book againſt Hereſies he thus expreſſed himſelf: *'Tis neceſſary to obey the Prieſts of the Church, who have their Succeſſion from the Apoſtles, who with Epiſcopal Succeſſion have received a certain Grace or Gift of Truth according to the Will of the Father, all others who Separate themſelves from the Principal Succeſſion, in whatever Place they may Combine together, we muſt ſuſpect as Heretics, and of a wrong Opinion; or as Schiſmatics, proud Men, full of the love of themſelves; or again as Hypocrites, thus dividing themſelves for Intereſts ſake and Vain-glory; who all of them are fallen from the Truth.* Is this to ſend us to read their Books? St. *Auguſtin* alſo muſt be own'd of a very different Principle, who having ſtated the Caſe as it is at preſent in this Nation, gives this oppoſite Advice in his Third Sermon on the 30th Pſalm: *Many Tongues contradict, divers Hereſies, divers Schiſms and Diviſions ſpeak loud,* what Method is to be followed in this Caſe? *Run you to the Tabernacle of God the Catholic Church* (of which no Hereſies contradicting one another can be Parts.) *Do not depart from that Rule of Truth,* (behold what Dr. *Sherlock* blames, and calls *Implicit Faith*) *you ſhall be protected in the Tabernacle of God from theſe contradicting Tongues.* This is the true way, taught and followed from the beginning, of Interpreting

Qui in Eccleſiâ ſunt Presbyteris obaudire oportet, qui ſucceſſionem habent ab Apoſtolis; qui cum Epiſcopali ſucceſſione charisma veritatis certum ſecundum placitum patris acceperunt: reliquos vero, qui abſiſtunt à Principali ſucceſſione & quocunque loco colliguntur, ſuſpectos habere vel quaſi Hæreticos & malæ ſententiæ, vel quaſi ſcindentes & elatos & ſibi placentes, aut rurſus ut Hypocritas quæſtus gratiâ & vanæ gloriæ hoc operantes, qui omnes decidunt à veritate. *l.* 4. *c.* 42.

Contradicunt multæ linguæ, diverſæ Hæreſes, diverſa Schiſmata perſonant, linguæ multæ contradicunt veritati: tu curre ad tabernaculum Dei, Eccleſiam Catholicam tene, à regulâ veritatis noli diſcedere, protegeris in tabernaculo Domini à contradictione linguarum. CC. 3. *in Pſ.* 20.

preting Scripture, of adhering to the genuin word of God, when the *Letter* bearing ſeveral Conſtructions, cannot reconcile different Opinions as the ſame holy Doctor obſerves; *We follow in this alſo the Authority of Canonical Scriptures, when we follow what is Decreed by the Univerſal preſent Church, which the Authority of the Scriptures themſelves recommends unto us; and becauſe the holy Scriptures cannot deceive us, whoever fears to be miſled by the obſcurity of this (or any other) Queſtion, let him conſult about it that Church, which we are without the leaſt obſcurity directed unto by the holy Scriptures.* This he had learn'd from St. *John*, who aſſures the Members of that Church, *That they are not to ſeek any other Maſters to teach them, having that Holy Spirit* (promiſed unto, and guiding that Church) *which teaches them all truth.* St. *Paul* was of a very different mind as well as Religion from Dr. *Sherlock*, when he orders even the Learned Biſhop *Titus, to avoid an Heretic after one or two endeavors to reclaim him, knowing that ſuch an one is caſt off, and is in ſin, being condemned by his own judgment*; which he oppoſes to that of the Church. The firſt General Councils, and the firſt Chriſtian Emperors, were of a different Religion and mind from this Doctor, who Commanded all the Books written by Heretics to be burnt. I will conclude this Point with St. *Auguſtins* Advice, perfectly oppoſite to theſe unreaſonable Principles, a ſeaſonable advice given to all Heretics wearied out with ſeeking in vain the truth by their own judgment, without the direction of this unerring Guide, *Return and lie at Anchor in the Haven of Catholic Faith, where no ſtorm of a wavering curioſity can diſturb you.*

Sequimur ſane in hâc re etiam Canonicarum Authoritatem Scripturarum, cum hoc facimus quod univerſæ Jam placuit Eccleſiæ quam ipſarum Scripturarum commendat Authoritas, &c. L. 1. Cont. Creſc. *c.* 31, 32, &c.

Non neceſſe habetis ut aliquis vos doceat, unctio enim ejus docet vos de omnibus. 1 *Joa.* 2.

Hæreticum hominem poſt unam & ſecundam Correptionem devita, ſciens quia ſubverſus eſt qui ejuſmodi eſt & delinquit cum ſit proprio Judicio condemnatus. *Tit.* 3. 10, 11.

Revertere & ſede in portu Catholicæ fidei ubi nulla te poſſit fluctuoſæ curioſitatis tempeſtas turbare *Aug.* in *Hypognoſt.*

Dr. *Sherlock* in his *Preſervative*, *f.* 4. gives his Proteſtant this advice. *Ask them whether they will allow you to judge for your ſelf in matters of Religion? If they do not, why will they trouble you with diſputing? You cannot be convinced unleſs you*

judge too; and thereby reſolve Faith into a private Spirit. ---Here let our Proteſtant fix his Foot, and not ſtir an Inch till they diſown Infallibility. I obſerved that this was to ſay, 'tis impoſſible to convince a man that in reaſon he ought to ſubmit his judgment to that of another, though infallible. That ſuch a Principle makes void all the right uſe of reaſon, when it ſhould lead us to ſubmit to a juſt Authority: that St. *Paul* pretended to Infallibility through the aſſiſtance of the Spirit of God who directed him, and conſequently, that if this Principle of Dr. *Sherlock* be reaſonable, the *Jews* ought when he diſputed in their Synagouge, *not to have ſtirr'd an inch*, not to have hearkened to him, till he had diſowned infallibility. In the Defence, the Honeſt Footman is aſhamed of ſo unchriſtian a Principle, and would diſown it, ſaying, *That it appears plain and natural to him, that he may ſubmit his judgment to an Infallible Judge, and yet the Church of* Rome *may not be that Judge*, true: but this is contrary to Dr. *Sherlock*'s Principle: For, how long is the Proteſtant *not to ſtir an inch*, till the Catholic hath proved his Churches infallibility? There would have been ſome common ſenſe and reaſon in that Advice: but, not ſo, ſays Dr. *Sherlock*, but *till he diſowns infallibility*. 'Tis as evident then as Noon-day-light, that Dr. *Sherlock* lookt upon infallibility pretended unto, as inconſiſtent with diſputing, and pretending by reaſon to convince an other of the truth, and that conſequently he takes the *Jews's* part againſt St. *Paul*. The *Footman* Miſtook here his Maſters Errant.

Preſervative, fol. 6. Dr. *Sherlock* asks this Queſtion, *What difference is there betwixt mens uſing their private judgment to turn* Papiſts *or to turn Proteſtants?* I anſwered: the ſame as betwixt two ſick men, the one whereof chooſes to put himſelf in an able Doctors hands, whom he knows to have an infallible Remedy, whilſt the other chooſes his own Simples, and makes his own Medicin. As between two at Law, the one whereof is guided by his Reaſon to take Advice from a wiſe Counſellor, the other to be his own Council, *&c.* The *Doctor*'s *ſecond* Anſwers by this Queſtion, *And is not here private Judgment uſed all this while?* A ſhrewd Queſtion indeed. Dr. *Sherlock* had asked *what difference* there was in theſe two uſes of private Judgment; I produce the difference, then

then as if the Queſtion had been forgot, ſtill ſays the *Footman*, there is uſe made of private Judgment: it were as nice a Reply, had one asked what difference is there betwixt an Ounce of Gold and an Ounce of Silver, if when the different value is expreſs'd, he ſhould wiſely return this anſwer, why there is ſtill an Ounce in both caſes. Is there no difference then betwixt one who follows his fancy in chooſing his way, and him who chooſes a good Guide, and follows him, becauſe both chooſe? do both equally rely on their fancy? What Poſition can more abuſe common ſenſe? Certainly the Ingenious and Learned Gentlemen of the *Temple*, cannot but ſmile at this ſtrange way of Reaſoning in their Maſter, ſo different from theirs.

Preſervative, fol. 9. *They cannot with any ſenſe diſpute with us about the particular Articles of Faith, becauſe the ſenſe given of Scripture and Fathers, takes its Authority from the Church underſtanding it ſo.* I Replyed, that the ſenſe takes its Authority from God who ſpake the Word, though we are certain that we have the true ſenſe of that Word, becauſe we receive it from the Church, which is guided in delivering to us both the Letter and Senſe by the infallible Spirit of God, that is to abide with Her for ever, according to Chriſts promiſe, *Joh.* 14. 16. I added that if *John* and *William* diſpute, which is the right way to a place, *John* is not diſabled of convincing *William* of his miſtake, becauſe he receives the Reaſons he uſes from an infallible Guide. This was plain and full: what anſwers the *Doctor's ſecond*, He cites ſome Catholic Divines (how truly, it belongs not to my preſent purpoſe) ſaying, that the words of Scripture brought in proof of *Tranſubſtantiation* might be taken in a different ſenſe from that which the Catholic Church hath ever received and delivered: and that had not the Church ever taught that ſenſe, one might believe otherwiſe for all the Letter of Scripture. Let it be ſo; but what follows here? But the neceſſity of an unerring Interpreter? So, that Text 1 *Joh.* 5. 7, 8. *There be three which give Teſtimony in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghoſt, and theſe three be one, and there be three which give teſtimony on Earth, the Spirit, Water, and Blood, and theſe three be one*, in the ſenſe the Church hath ever received it in, proves

the ſtrict Unity of God in the Trinity of Perſons: The *Arians* gave it a contrary, and as natural a ſenſe; doth this prove that we follow not Scripture, and this very Text in our belief of the Holy Trinity? Once more I appeal to the Learned Gentlemen of the *Temple*, hoping they will join with me, maintaining againſt their Maſter, that all the Judges of the Land may very reaſonably convince by Law an impertinent Party, though he ſhould oppoſe that they may not do it, becauſe their Interpretation of the Law, is to deliver the true ſenſe of it.

The *Preſervative*, fol. 11. moves this Queſtion. *Muſt the belief of an infallible Judge be reſolved into every mans private judgment? Muſt it not be believed with a Divine Faith, and can there be a Divine Faith without an infallible Judge?* I gave this anſwer; There can be no Divine Faith, without a Divine Revelation, nor a prudent one without a Moral evidence in the Motives of Credibility, on which may be grounded the evident obligation to accept it. The judgment being poſſeſs'd with that Moral infallibility, reſts not there, but obſerving that goodneſs and mercy of God, which cannot permit that falſhood ſhould be propounded in his Name, with all the apparent marks of his Hand and Seal, and without any like appearance on the Contrary, inclined by a pious motion of the Will, called by the famous Council of *Orange affectio credibilitatis*, and ſtrengthen'd by that Grace of God, which beſtows the *Gift of Faith*, faſtens on Gods Veracity, and with a ſubmiſſion not capable of any doubt, embraces the revealed truth. If the infallibility of the Church were more than Morally evident, it were impoſſible that any Hereſy ſhould be. To this the *Second of Dr.* Sherlock hath nothing to oppoſe, and is willing to ſubmit if I can *ſhew a Revelation that there is an infallible viſible Church.* I will comply with ſo reaſonable a demand: and ſince not one in a thouſand of thoſe who oppoſe our Doctrin in this fundamental Point, which once being cleared, bears away all diſputes, underſtands what that infallibility means, on which we ground the admirable certainty of each Point of our Belief, give me leave Sir, to be ſomwhat more prolix on this Subject than the narrow compaſs of a Letter would otherwiſe allow.

What

What is, and whence proceeds this infallibility? Many do ſuppoſe and object unto us, that we hold a Man, or many to be infallible in themſelves, a Title to which God alone can lay a Claim, who only as he is *truth*, ſo he is alone infallible. They wilfully ſuppoſe, that we place this infallibility in the ſenſe and judgment of men, ſo that whatever by their own Light they reſolve and order, muſt infallibly be true and juſt; that ſuch may frame new Articles of Faith, and a new Religion; or at leaſt *Phanatick*-like by Enthuſiaſms, and new marvelous Revelations, make new additions to our Faith, ſo that we may have daily a different one; their Votaries like a blind Herd, being driven now to one Opinion, then to another, yet ſtill ſuppoſing themſelves infallibly right; all this is a monſtruous miſrepreſentation, without one word of truth; but men who themſelves follow a lawleſs fancy, and looſe liberty, muſt thus diſfigure that admirable Guide which God hath left us, otherwiſe they would ſoon be without any followers: this account I ſhall deliver here of the infallible Guide, which Catholics follow, *the Church of God*, will I am ſure repreſent her in very different, becauſe in her true proper Colours.

Our Guide then is the Catholic Church, either diffuſive in its whole extent, or repreſentative in its Head, and Biſhops, the Pope, and a General Council; for as in the State here in *England*, we have a *Common Law*, and a *Statute Law*, the firſt not compiled by any one Lawgiver, but delivered by all the Judges and Sages of the Law, and preſerved in all Courts, and the daily uſe of the whole Kingdom; the ſecond delivered particularly by the Kingdoms Great Repreſentative in its Head and Members, the King, and lawfully convened Parliaments. So in the Church there is a general Faith, firſt received from Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and preſerved by all Biſhops in their reſpective Dioceſſes, and in the mind and actions of each faithful Believer in the whole Catholic Church; and when any difficulty ariſes by the oppoſition of new Hereſies, then the Church Repreſentative the Pope, and a General Council, or Synod of the ableſt and Holieſt Biſhops of the Catholic Church, deliver their Sentence in favour of the ancient Truth ever followed in the Church, which

which Decisions, or Canons, are like our Statute Law, only declaring, and applying to particular instances the Common Law, or Belief of the Church. We hold that this general Faith received from the Apostles, and preserved in all the Members of the Catholic Church, explained upon occasion by the Church Representative is infallibly true, and this is all the infallibility the Catholic Church pretends unto, neither the whole Church, nor any person, or persons in it, are held to possess any intrinsick infallibility, which we own to be proper to God alone. Nay no man in this present state or condition of life, as our Divines observe, can be in himself *impeccable*, or *infallible*, all are of themselves subject to Error, as well as to sin, and whatever God doth in favour of his Church, doth no more alter her defectibility, than a strong man lifting up a great weight with a Child, takes away the natural weakness of the Child, which remains still the same, though the weight not moveable to the Child, be in effect drawn or lifted up. Hence *Rufinus* observes, that we do not say in our *Creed*, I believe in the Holy Catholic Church, as we say *I believe* in God the Father, *In* Jesus Christ, *In* the Holy Ghost. By that Preposition, that syllable *in*, we *separate the Creator from his Creatures, Divine help from Humane means, but we say of these humane means appointed by Almighty God*, that although they be fallible, and exposed to error in their own nature, yet by Gods appointment and Grace, they will prove infallible as to us, and certainly lead to the knowledge of truth. We do not say that they cannot of themselves deceive us, but that God according to his promise directing them by his infallible Spirit; it cannot possibly happen that they should deceive us: If then says S. *Thomas* our Creed (as many understand it) teaches us to believe *in* the Catholic Church, this is the sence of it. That is to say, our Faith leans on the Holy Ghost, and the meaning of these words are, *I believe in the Holy Ghost, who sanctifies the holy Church, and Guides her*. When God revealed to St. *Paul* that he should come to *Rome* and die there, or to St. *Peter*, that being grown old he should be Crucified: were either of them *immortal*, the one till he came to *Rome*, the other till he became old? not the least, they were as frail as before,

Scotus in 2. diff. 2, 3. Q.

In *Symb. art. Eccles.* S. *Cat.* Hac prepositionis syllaba Creator a Creaturis secernitur, & divina humanis separantur.

Hoc est intelligendum secundum quod fides nostra refertur in Spiritum sanctum Sanctificantem Ecclesiam.

as

as expoſed to Diſeaſes within, as capable of being wounded and that mortally, yet in a true ſenſe they were *immortal* for that time, becauſe that by reaſon of the Revelation and protection of God, it was impoſſible they ſhould die before they came the one to *Rome*, the other to old Age, according to the Revelation. Thus ſhould God reveal to a Traveller in a wild Wilderneſs full of wild Beaſts, and beſet by Thieves, that he ſhould *paſs certainly* unhurt, and not fall, he, nor thoſe who follow him, into the Hands of theſe, or Claws of thoſe; this man would remain as weak, as ignorant of the ways, as expoſed to danger as before, yet would prove an infallible Guide to thoſe who would follow him. So ſuppoſing (which I ſhall preſently prove) that God hath promiſed to the Catholic Church, that his holy Spirit ſhould guide her in all truth; that ſhe ſhall follow that true Guide, and ever avoid falling into Error, though each Member of the Church remain as fallible, as weak, as ſubject to Error as before; yet it evidently follows, that this Church will infallibly avoid all Errors, never lead any of her followers into it; and this is all we mean by the Churches infallibility? A thing when thus rightly underſtood, as clear, as evident, as certain, as that God's Revelation cannot prove falſe, as that the Holy Ghoſt and Chriſt himſelf (who remains with the Teachers of this Church) be in themſelves infallible. We do not expect any new Revelations or Lights; we do not admit any new Article of Faith, though, where a doubt ariſes the Church hath infallibly power to declare what hath been revealed by Chriſt to the Apoſtles, and Preached by them, which perchance ſome part of the Church might have had a leſs clear underſtanding thereof, and though when the ſenſe of Scripture appears doubtful to ſome, this Church can explain infallibly what the true ſenſe and meaning is, and deliver more explicitly what is implyed in the Word of Scripture: for example, if ſome doubts whether in the Myſtery of our Lords Supper there be a true Change of the ſubſtance of Bread, into that of the Body of our Lord. This Holy Church can declare, that theſe plain words, *This is my Body*, do declare it, and to avoid further miſtake, may give a new clearer Name to the old Myſtery ſo revealed by Chriſt, and

Preached

Preached by the Apoſtles, calling it *Tranſubſtantiation*; as She calls the Myſtery of God, one in Nature, and three in Perſons, Holy *Trinity*, a Name not found in Scripture, which ſo diſpleaſed the *Arians* heretofore, and *Calvin* of late; not by making any new Article of Faith, but more clearly delivering what was ever believed by the Apoſtles, and all Catholics from their time to this: ſo that ſtill we own

Scotus Q. 2. prologi. *Sanctæ Scripturæ ſufficienter Continent omnem ſcientiam Neceſſariam Viatori.* That Holy Scripture contain, all that is neceſſary to a Chriſtian to know in this life; and with *Bellarmin*, *Non eſt de fide niſi quod Deus, per Apoſtolos, aut Prophetas revelavit, aut quod evidenter inde deducitur.* That nothing is of Faith, but what Chriſt revealed by the Prophets, or Apoſtles, or what is Evidently deduced from it. The Church being only our Guide to the underſtanding of the true and full ſenſe of Scripture. This Pope *Celeſtin* owned to the

Ep. 7. General Council of *Epheſus*; *Agendum nunc eſt ut Labore Communi Credita & per Apoſtolorum ſucceſſione detenta ſervemus.* That the whole work of the Church repreſentative is only to Conſerve by a clear Expoſition of it, what the Church diffuſive retained in a continual Succeſſion, as firſt taught by the holy Apoſtles, and ſo continually by their Succeſſors. This is all the Council of *Trent* pretended unto: For Councils, ſays an Eminent Member of it, have the aſſiſting preſence of the Holy Ghoſt, only to declare thoſe Articles infallibly true, which Chriſt from the beginning revealed; And Secondly, When Errors and Abuſes ariſe to a growth, to gather infallibly from what hath been revealed, thoſe Truths, which all Chriſtians are bound to believe, and to follow in Faith and Manners.

Vega. *Ad Extirpandos errores, & abuſus infalliBiliter, etiam ex revelatis Colligere populo Chriſtiano credenda & uſurpanda in fide & moribus.* Then continues the ſame. They are gathered in the Name of Chriſt, when they declare only ſuch things, as were revealed by Chriſt, and brought down to us in the Holy Scripture, or certain Apoſtolical Traditions. The Apoſtles themſelves uſed no other Method, and

Rom. 15. St. *Paul* as Infallible as he was, owned, That he preſumed to teach only what he had from Chriſt, to which witneſs was born by Miracles. *Non Audio aliquid loqui eorum quæ*

per

Per me non efficit Chriſtus in veritate ſignorum. And this infallible Certainty we allow to the Church only in ſuch things, as She declares neceſſary to be known, and believed in order to our Salvation, not in impertinent or indifferent things; For we ſay ſtill with *Tertullian*, *Nobis curioſitate non opus eſt poſt Chriſtum, inquiſitione poſt Evangelium.* We ſeek not curiouſly into any thing, but what is clearly revealed; but what was taught when the Goſpel was firſt preached. Our Church then hath not power to make new Articles of Faith, nor ever pretended to it, but is a *mere* yet *infallible* Witneſs to the anciently revealed ones: In Her Name *Tertullian* declares, *Nobis nihil licet ex noſtro arbitrio inducere, Apoſtolos Domini habemus Authores, qui nec ipſi quidquam de ſuo arbitrio elegerunt quod inducerent.* Ibidem.

We can bring in nothing of our choice, the Apoſtles are the Authors of what we teach, who themſelves taught nothing of themſelves. Chriſt promiſed to be with them, and their Succeſſors till the end of the World, only in order to the declaring of theſe things, which he himſelf revealed and taught eſpecially in thoſe forty days betwixt his Reſurrection and Aſcenſion, when he taught them all that concerned the Kingdom of God on Earth, his Church. *Mat.* 28. Omnia quæcunque mandavi vobis. Et loquens de regno dei.

The infallibility of the Church being thus Expounded, and ſuch is that which Catholics believe, and are guided by; I cannot conceive how any Chriſtian can object any thing againſt it, who believes that what God revealed muſt neceſſarily be true, and that Chriſt and the Holy Ghoſt be infallible. I proceed then to prove that God hath revealed the Catholic Church ſhould ever be guided by his holy Spirit, and ever follow that Guide, and never fall into any Error in Faith, and to do it moſt convincingly againſt all Sectaries, I will prove it by the Texts of Holy Scripture, ſuch as their very Bible offers, and this not by two or three, which would ſuffice, but by a number, and that I may not ſeem to give my own ſenſe to thoſe Texts, I will join to them the Expoſition of the Holy Fathers, given in all Ages, according to the ſenſe of the Catholic Church.

By the Catholic Church I mean not only the Church of all Ages, but the whole Church of any Ages, and conſequently

the Catholic Church of this Age, for it is the ſame Church, there being but *One*, as all our Creed teaches us. I ſay as the *Jews* did *yield a full belief to God, and his Servant Moyſes*; to God as the author of their Faith, and to *Moyſes* as the Propounder and Witneſs of it; ſo each Catholic in any Age believes God and the Church of his Age, that Church being *Cauſa Exemplaris*, the Pattern and Expoſition of his Faith.

Exod. 14. Crediderunt domino & Moyſi ſervo ejus.

That this Church is an infallible Witneſs to all that Chriſt did teach, is evident from the Commands laid upon us by the Prophets, by Chriſt our Lord, by the Apoſtles, to receive with an entire ſubmiſſion all that it delivers, for it is inconſiſtent with Gods infinite Veracity, that he ſhould oblige us to believe an Error. Almighty God by *Iſay*, teaches us, that *all Nations ſhall reſort unto Her as a Judge.* Adding, *Every tongue reſiſting thee in judgment, thou ſhalt condemn*; and, *the Nation and Kingdom that will not ſerve thee ſhall periſh.* The plain reaſon for it is given by *Ezekiel*, where God promiſes that when Controverſies ariſe, he will decide by his Churches Verdict, *They ſhall ſtand in judgment, and ſhall judge according to my Judgment.* Hence St. *Auguſtin* looking upon the judgment of the Church as *certainly* that of God, declares; the only reaſon, why St. *Cyprian*, though in an Error, yet was no Heretic, to be, becauſe his Error was not yet Condemned by the Churches Repreſentative, a General Council: That a *moſt firm belief* is to be yielded to ſuch Deciſions, and that *Not to ſubmit to the Church is the higheſt impiety, or the moſt raſh arrogancy.* In fine, that by the Authority of ſuch Councils, *Truth is ſetled and confirmed, and all doubts are removed.* The Oracle of Chriſt our Lord in this caſe ſtands, *Mat.* 8. *If he ſubmit not to the Church, let him be to thee as a Heathen and a Publican.* This St. *Cyprian* was convinced of when he declared, That *no one can have God for a Father, who pays not to the Church the ſubmiſſive Duties which a Mother hath right to challenge; that as no one out of the Ark eſcaped death in the Deluge, ſo no one can avoid periſhing, if he revolt*

Iſay 2. 3. 54. 7. 60. 12. *Ezech.* 44.

Nondum plenario Concilio deciſus. l. 1. c. 18. de Bapt. Certiſſimam fidem. ibid. c. 9. c. 4. Nolle primasdare vel ſumæ impietatis eſt, vel præcipitis arrogantiæ. De util. *Cred.* c. 17. Donec plenario totius orbis Concilio, quod ſaluberrime ſentiebatur etiam remotis dubitationibus firmaretur.

Habere Jam non poteſt Deus Patrem, qui Eccleſiam non habet Matrem, &c. Neque enim vivere foris poſſunt, cum Domus Dei una ſit: Et nemini ſalus eſſe niſi in Eccleſiâ poſſit. *Cypr.* de Unit.

from

from the Church; that no one can live (to God) *and be out of her Obedience, because that God hath but one House, and no body can be saved out of the Church.* Next the practice of the Apostles, for as we find *Acts* 15. there being a debate about the Obligation that Christians lay under in reference to the *Law*, *they appointed* Paul *and* Barnabas *to go up, and certain others of the rest, to the Apostles and Priests unto* Hierusalem *upon this Question*——*There was made a great disputation*, and the Conclusion was, this Decision of the Church; *It seemed good to the Holy-Ghost and unto us*, &c. according to the Promise made by Christ, *Joh.* 15. 16. *When the* Paraclite *comes, He shall give testimony to me, and You shall give testimony to me*; which words assert the future perpetual union in the same sense, betwixt the Invisible infallible Spirit, and the Visible Church: Hence St. *Cyril*, Patriarch of *Hierusalem*, owned the true Church to be called Catholic, not only by reason of her Continuation in all Ages, and extent into all places, but also by reason that *She teaches Catholicly, that is, Universally, without any* Error *or* Variance *all that a Christian ought to know, submitting piously to her Authority all sorts of men, both Princes and People.* St. *Paul* though an Inspired Scripture-writer, owned this Ordinary Authority as the only sure Guide, saying of himself (*Gal.* 2. 1. *I went up according to Revelation*) God ordering it for our Example, and instruction) *and conferr'd with them the Gospel which I preached*——*lest perhaps I should have run or had run in vain.* Not that the Churches approbation added any thing to the truth which had been revealed to him, whence he says, *To me those that seemed to be something, added nothing.* So now the Churches Authority addeth nothing to the truth revealed in Scripture, but *offers infallibly* that truth to be obey'd. In which sense St. *Augustin* owned, that he would *not believe the Gospel, were he not moved to it by the Authority of the Catholic Church*; to wit, the present one then declaring against the *Manicheans*: *for the Church*, as St. *Cyprian* had observed before him, *that is, the people united to their Priest, the Flock adhering to their*

Ecclesia vocatur Catholica quia docet Catholice, hoc est, universaliter & sine ullo defectu, vel differentiâ, omnia dogmata quæ debent venire in cognitionem. ——Omne hominum genus pié subjugat Principes & privatos. *Cyr. Hier.* Catech. 8.

Ego vero Evangelio non crederem, nisi me Catholicæ Ecclesiæ commoveret Authoritas ad Ep. fund. 5. Etsi contumax & superba obundire volentium multitudo, Ecclesia tamen â Christo non recedit; Et illi sunt Ecclesia plebs sacerdoti adunata, & Pastori suo grex adhærens. Ep. 69.

Paſtor, never falls off from Chriſt, though ſtubborn and proud multitudes of men fall off from Her. How can God abandon the Church to Errors, and yet give her Teachers and Paſtors the Power to exact a *full ſubmiſſion of judgment*, this St. *Paul* bears witneſs unto (2 *Cor.* 10.) *The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God, caſting down all imaginations or reaſonings, and every thing that exalts it ſelf againſt the knowledge, and bringing into Captivity all underſtanding in obedience to Chriſt*, and he declares to the *Epheſians*, (4. 11. before cited) that theſe Paſtors, whoſe teaching will preſerve us from wavering, and from being toſt to and fro, will ſtill be *until we all come unto the unity of Faith, until the Body of Chriſt be built*, which will not be compleat till the Worlds End.

Yet our Merciful God to bear away all cavilling excuſes of thoſe who ſhould pretend the Church to have been left and abandoned by her Teacher, the infallible Spirit of God, hath moſt clearly ingaged his unerring Word for the contrary. *This is my reſt*, (ſays he by *David*) *for ever and ever here will I dwell, becauſe I have choſen it.* And St. *Paul* aſſures us, that this Houſe of God is the Church of the living God, to omit the greater number of theſe Promiſes by *Iſay*, he offers theſe: *Thou ſhalt be no more forſaken* (as the Synagogue) *but thou ſhalt be called my delight in her: upon thy Walls*, Hieruſalem, *I have appointed Watchmen all the day and all the night*, (in the calm of Peace and in the ſtorms of Perſecution) *for ever they ſhall not hold their peace.* ——*There ſhall come a Redeemer to* Sion, *and to them that ſhall return from iniquity in* Jacob, *ſays our Lord, as for me, this is my Covenant with them, my Spirit that is in thee, and my words that I have put in thy mouth, ſhall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy Seed, nor out of the mouth of thy Seeds Seed, from the preſent and for ever*, by *Hieremy* he promiſes, *I will give them one heart and one way, that they may fear me for ever, I will make an everlaſting Covenant with them, that I will not turn away from them, but will put my fear in their hearts, that they ſhall not depart from me.* By *Ezechiel* he thus expreſſes himſelf, *There ſhall be one Shepherd over them, all they ſhall walk in my Judgements.* ——*I will ſet my Sanctuary in the midſt of them for ever.*

Pſal. 132.

1 *Tim.* 13. 15.

Iſay. 60. 10. 62. 3.

Idem. 59.

Hier. 32.

Ezech. 37. 24.

By

By *Malachy* thus, *I will make her who was caſt off* (the Church gathered amongſt the *Gentils*) *a ſtrong Nation, and the Lord ſhall reign over them, from hence forth and for ever.* And by the Prophet *Oſee*, he aſſures that Church, *That he hath Eſpouſed her in Faith for ever.* Was it poſſible that God ſhould reveal more expreſly, more fully, that his Church ſhould never fail to follow the directions of her Guide the Holy Ghoſt? what wonder that all holy Fathers ſhould continually deliver us a truth, of which they had received ſo frequent and plain Revelations? *St. Cyprian* following the Prophet *Oſee*, aſſures us, that *this Spouſe* of Chriſt can never fall into Adultery, muſt remain *Chaſt and unſtained, ever dwell in One Houſe, and that conſequently who ever forſakes her, and adheres to an Adultereſs* (any Heretical or Sciſmatical Congregation) *looſes all right to the Promiſes made to the Church.* So certain was St. *Gregory Nazianzen* that this Church could never admit any *Heretics* into her *Communion*, That as zealous an oppoſer as he was to the *Apollinariſts*, he owned he would acquieſce to them if they could prove they had *ever* been received into the Catholic Churches Communion, which would be an undoubted proof that they were fallen into no Hereſie. And *in that caſe it could not be otherwiſe but that they did aſſent to truth.* St. *Athanaſius* owned this Rule ſo infallible, that he conceived *no other Arguments ought to be uſed* againſt Heretics but this, *which alone, is ſufficient; that their Opinion was not the Doctrin of the Orthodox Church, that our Anceſtors were of another perſwaſion.* But what debate can there be of this truth amongſt Chriſtians after ſo plain a deciſion of Chriſts own Divine Mouth (*Matt.* 16. 18.) *The Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt her*; having firſt aſſured *Peter* that he was a Rock (unmoveable) and that on that Rock he would build his Church. On *Peter* then and his Succeſſors, not on their Shoulders indeed (as a *Proteſtant* Divine very briskly proved) but on their perſonal

Adulterari non poteſt ſponſa Chriſti, incorrupta eſt & pudica, unam domum novit. ——Quiſquis ab Eccleſiâ ſegregatus Adulteræ jungitur, à promiſſis Eccleſiæ ſeparatur. *Cypr.* de Unit. Eccleſ.

Si *nunc vel ante* ſuſcepti ſunt qui *Apollinaris* placita ſectantur, hoc oſtendant & nos aquieſcemus. Perſpicuum enim Erit eos ut rectæ Doctrinæ aſſentientes ſuſceptos fuiſſe, nec enim ſe res aliter habere poteſt ſi hoc conſequuti ſunt.

Epiſt. ad Cledon. Tantummodo ad ea reſpondendum eſt, quod ipſum per ſe ſufficit, ea Eccleſiæ Orthodoxæ noti eſſe, nec Majores noſtros ita ſenſiſſe. Epiſt. ad Epict Epiſt. Corinth.

nal unmoveable Faith this Church is ever to be built; whence all holy Fathers have ever derived the Infallibility of Doctrin promiſed to the Church: Let the great Patriarch of *Alexandria* S. *Cyril* be an Inſtance of it: *This Sirname of Rock* (ſays he) *is the unmoveable and moſt firm Faith of this Diſciple, on which the Church of Chriſt ſhould be ſo founded and ſetled, that it ſhould prove impregnable to the Gates of Hell, laſting for ever.* And that all might know, that 'tis the virtue of the Holy Ghoſt, by whoſe Infallibility in Guiding, the Church remains Infallible in being Guided, our Saviour informs his Apoſtles of it, and us by them, *Joh.* 14. 16. *He* (my Father) *will give you another Paraclite, that may abide with you for ever,* (and conſequently with their Succeſſors, as a Land given to one for ever, by force thereof belongs to his Heirs) *the Spirit of Truth, whom the World knows not.* St. *Ambroſe*, who obſerved no ſuch Promiſe made to particular Men reading Scripture, had hence reaſon to conclude, *Let no Man make the Law the meaſure of his Faith, but report it to the Church in which the Grace of the ſeven-fold Spirit ſhines, whom that Prince of the Prieſts doth enlighten with Rays of the Divinity from above.* Hence *Origen* concuded, That *the Son of God, as the Scriptures teach us, is the Soul of the Body of Chriſt, which is the Church of Chriſt.—That the Word of God by a wonderful Virtue moves together all the Members of his Church:* And can it enter into a Chriſtians thought, that a Body guided by the Holy Ghoſt, moved by Chriſt, ſhall ever go aſtray? But *Tertullian* repreſents with a moſt ſenſible Energy the weakneſs of thoſe who can harbor the leaſt ſuſpicion of it. *The Holy Ghoſt* (ſays he) *to this intent was ſent by Chriſt, to this end was asked of the Father, that he ſhould be the Teacher of Truth; Did this Steward of God neglect his Office? Did this Vicar of Chriſt permit the Church to believe, to teach otherwiſe than Chriſt himſelf Preached by his Apoſtles?* St. *Paul* did not believe it poſſible, when he called the Church not only *the Houſe of God*, but alſo *the Pillar of Truth.* I omit here thoſe plain Texts of Scripture to be found ſo frequently in it, by which Chriſt declares

Petram opinor per agnominationem nihil aliud quam inconcuſſam & firmiſſimam diſcipuli fidem vocavit, in quâ Eccleſiâ Chriſti ita fundata & firmata eſſet, ut non laberetur & eſſet inexpugnabilis inferorum portis in perpetuum manens. *Cyril. in Dial. ad Prin. l.* 4.

Nemo fidem ſuam intra menſuram legis includat, ſed ad Eccleſiam conferat, in quâ ſeptiformis Spiritus gratia relucet, quam Princeps ille Sacerdotum fulgore ſuperna divinitatis illuminat. *Lib.* 7. *c.* 11. *in Luc.*

Lib. 6. *contra Celſ.*

declares this Churches Perpetuity, only minding you, Sir, of that Saying of one of the moſt famous and Learned Primates of this Kingdom, *'Tis the ſame in the Church to Err and to Periſh.* Wherefore ſince the latter cannot happen, if God in revealing cannot Err, we may conclude with him, that to ſay it can Err, *is a Sacrilegious Vanity which the Authority of the Prophets, of the Goſpels, of the Fathers utterly reproves.* That what Promiſes were made to the Apoſtles for the Support and Continuance of the Church, are made good to their Succeſſors, the lawful Paſtors, Reaſon it ſelf evidently makes out, God not withdrawing the Means whilſt he deſigns the End. And St. *Auguſtin* expreſſes it fully in theſe words, Commenting on thoſe of the Royal Prophet, *For thy Fathers, Children are born to thee: The Apoſtles did beget thee, they were ſent, they Preached, they were thy Fathers, but could they remain for ever with us? Was then the Church deſerted by their departure? God forbid! For thy Fathers, Children were born to thee, Biſhops were Conſtituted.— Think not thy ſelf abandon'd, becauſe thou ſeeſt not* Peter, *thou ſeeſt not* Paul: *Out of thy Iſſue Fathers are given thee.* Hence in his Diſpute he wonder'd at the ſenſleſs Poſition of *Gaudentius* the *Donatiſt*, teaching that the Church had Periſhed, and yet owning their Congregation to be the true Church; ſince *Donatus* could not be a Father in the true Church, had he not been a Son thereof, had ſhe Periſhed before he laid the Foundation of his Schiſmatical Body? Againſt the ſame Heretics and the Schiſmatics of theſe Days he is as plain on the Pſal. 103. *What mean ſome* (ſays he in the Name of the Church) *who abandoning me, murmur againſt me? How do thoſe loſt Men pretend that I Periſh? for they ſay I was and am not. Tell me (O Lord) how ſhort are my days, how long I ſhall laſt on Earth: And he announced it to me, and ſaid, Behold, I am with you to the end of Ages. What can be ſaid more plain?* This Church then, or this Communion with lawful Biſhops, this *Univerſal Communion*, as St. *Auguſtin* calls it, will ever be guided by the Holy Ghoſt *infallibly* in the knowledge

Idem eſt errare & perire Eccleſiam.—Hanc ſacrilegam vanitatem evertit Evangelica veritas, & Prophetarum atque SS. Patrum non violanda authoritas. *Lanfranc. contr. Bereng.*

Genuerunt te Apoſtoli, ipſi miſſi ſunt, ipſi prædicatores, ipſi patres; ſed numquid nobiſcum ipſi ſemper eſſe potuerunt. Ergo eorum diſceſſu deſerta eſt Eccleſia? Abſit, pro Apoſtolis nati ſunt tibi filii, conſtituti ſunt Epiſcopi, &c. *Aug. in Pſal.* 44.

Lib. 2. *c.* 8. *contra Gauden.*

Quid eſt quod neſcio, qui recedentes à me murmurant contra me? quid eſt quod perditi me periſſe contendunt? certe enim hoc dicunt quia fui & non ſum. Annuntia mihi paucitatem dierum meorum, quam diu ero in hoc ſæculo, & annuntiavit, & dixit, ecce ego vobiſcum ſum uſque ad conſummationem ſæculi, totius orbis Communio. *Aug. l.* 2. *c.* 2. *cont. Gaud.*

knowledge of Truth. They believe right who are in this Communion, they are in Error who are out of it: This is the moſt palpable and moſt ſecure way of diſcerning the Truth. Wherefore St. *Auguſtin* tells us, that diſputing againſt *Fortunatus* an Heretical Biſhop, he preſſed him (but in vain) to *anſwer one Queſtion, pretending that the Anſwer to it would, as it was manifeſt to all, clear their Controverſie*, Whether he could give Letters of Communion (which ſhould be accepted of by Biſhops in all Parts of the World) *whither ever he ſhould aſſign him.* We ask *Proteſtant* Biſhops here the ſame Queſtion; and becauſe there is not *One* Biſhop in the whole World, out of his Majeſty's Dominions, that will own their Doctrin, and acknowledge himſelf of the ſame Church with them, we conclude with St. *Auguſtin*, that there is no need of a farther Debate, it being evident they belong not unto, and are no part of the Catholic Church: and they may ſhare betwixt us and themſelves this Sentence of St. *Auguſtin*'s Scholar S. *Proſper*: *A Chriſtian in Communion with this Univerſal Church, is a Catholic, if ſeparated from it, an Heretic.*; which is the very Sentence of St. *John* in the very Text which Dr. *Sherlock*'s Footman cited againſt me. I have been ſomewhat profuſe on this Subject, becauſe it is of the greateſt importance, and to ſhew what ſilly Queſtions are propoſed unto us as unanſwerable, to which each Leaf of Scripture, each holy Father yield a ready Anſwer againſt them, and for us.

Quærebam utrum Epiſtolas Communicatorias, quas formatas dicimus, poſſet, quo vellem, dare; & affirmabam, quod manifeſtum eſſet omnibus, hoc modo facillime illam terminari poſſe quæſtionem. *Aug. Ep.* 163. Huic generali Eccleſiæ communicans Chriſtianus Catholicus eſt, ab hâc ſegregatus Hæreticus. *S. Proſp. in dim. temp. c.* 5.

Preſer. Fol. 17. *No underſtanding Proteſtant can be diſputed into this kind of Popery, which owns an Infallible Church: Firſt, becauſe no Arguments or Diſputations can give me an infallible certainty of the Infallibility of the Church.*

Anſwer. I obſerved, that this way of Reaſoning was a Plea for the *Jews* againſt *Chriſt* our Lord; this Poſition proving, that *Chriſt* our Lord, who own'd himſelf Infallible, did imprudently to Preach or work Miracles, by which he exacted a certain firm Faith grounded upon his Infallibility in Teaching: for ſince his Preaching and Miracles did not give an *Evident infallible certainty* of his Infallibility, (and ſuch an evident one Dr. *Sherlock* muſt mean, for the certainty we have of a real

a real Infallibility cannot be in reality Fallible) no prudent Jew or *Gentile* could be diſputed by *Chriſt* into Faith. Arguments ſo offenſive to pious Ears, ought to meet with no other Anſwer than Prayers for him who offers them.

Firſt, he tells me the Arguments which I call offenſive to pious Ears are mentioned 2 *Tim.* 4. 3. *Next*, he asks me, Whether my Reaſons and Arguments for my Churches Infallibility, and thoſe which *Chriſt* offered with the addition of Miracles, hold a Compariſon? *Thirdly*, he tells me, that *Chriſt*, tho' Infallible, tho' he wrought Miracles to confirm his Doctrin, *did not command them to be content with an Implicit Faith*, but the contrary: *Search the Scripture*, Joh. 5. 39. and Mark 12. 24. tells them they *Erred, not knowing the Scripture.* Then he concludes, that Dr. *Sherlock did not ſay that the Jews could not be diſputed into Faith, unleſs that Faith were infallible*: No, he leaves that to be talked of by us, who are the great Pretenders to it. *Defence Pa. 7.*

An *Error* ever draws on a *greater* to its defence, and *Hereſie* ſeldom ſupports her ſelf without *Blaſphemy*; we have both here in ſtore. As for his firſt Obſervation, I underſtand not the meaning of it, the Text hinted at being this, *There ſhall be time when they will not bear ſound Doctrin, but according to their own deſires they will heap to themſelves Maſters, having itching Ears.* I blamed not the Hearers, but the Teacher; and in this particular Caſe I am very well ſatisfied, that the witty and Learned Gentlemen of the *Temple*, are ſo far from hearing this Doctrin of Dr. *Sherlock* with itching Ears, that they pity his Ignorance, and blame his forwardneſs, and bluſh at ſo weak and ill-knit a piece of Sophiſtry; and therefore I willingly ſubmit what I write in this Engagement, to their Cenſure. As to the *Queſtion* he asks me, his ignorance of our Belief prompts it to him: For we believe our Church Infallible by the Infallibility of *Chriſt* who remains with her, and of the Holy Ghoſt who guides her into all Truths: And for this we bring the ſame Proofs, to wit, Prophecies, *Chriſt*'s Preaching it, and his Miracles Confirming it, beſides the continual viſible Event of *Chriſt*'s Prophecies concerning his Church. This *Queſtion* then is very ſilly. *Anſwer.*

But his two Proofs are in another Strain; by the Firſt he

intimates, That *Chriſt* could not have challeng'd an *Implicit Faith* reaſonably from the *Jews*: A Poſition which, *to the ſhame of Chriſtianity*, this laſt Age and pretended *Reformation* hath often offered and ſupported: Contrary to *Chriſt*'s own Sacred words, who often urged the *Jews* to believe his words on the account of his miraculous *Works*, by which if he had not proved the truth of his words, he owned that *they had not had ſin*. The Matter is finely mended, and Chriſtianity is brought by theſe Men to a fair paſs, when *Chriſt*'s words are not to be believed by *an Implicit Faith*. The Church of God, tho' Infallible, ſends as much to the Scriptures as *Chriſt* did, ſince that ſhe offers each Point of the Faith ſhe teaches, as delivered immediately or mediately in the Holy Scriptures. The Prophecies of himſelf which *Chriſt* cited, were indeed to be ſought and found in the Scriptures; but 'tis a pleaſant Fancy to apply thoſe words, *Search the Scriptures*, to all that *Chriſt* did teach; as if the Goſpels, and whatever *Chriſt* did Preach, contained no *new Revelations*, nothing but what could be found in the *ancient Teſtament*. A great ſtock of Patience is neceſſary to anſwer calmly ſuch Impertinencies as are brought to ſupport the Errors with which theſe late Hereſies are patch'd up. But the laſt Defence brought for Dr. *Sherlock* is ſurpriſing, and I could well quarrel with you, Sir, (as a Chriſtian) for Licenſing it. What, do you own that *we only* are to look on the Faith even as Preached by *Chriſt*, *as neceſſarily Infallible?* Is it no part of *your* Belief that you are any way concerned in, that *that certain Faith which* Chriſt *exacted from the* Jews, *St.* Paul *from each Chriſtian*, muſt of neceſſity be Infallible?

Preſervative. *'Tis impoſſible by Reaſon to prove, that Men muſt not make uſe of their own Reaſon and Judgment in Matters of Religion.*

Anſwer. Fol. 5. That Men muſt uſe Reaſon to come to this Knowledge, *that God hath revealed what they believe*, is very certain. As the *Jews*, Exod. 14. *Crediderunt Domino & Moyſi ſervo ejus*, *Did believe God and* Moſes *his Servant*; As all Nations believed *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*; So each Chriſtian now believes *Chriſt and his Church*; the firſt as Author, the ſecond as Witneſſes (Commiſſion'd from God) of their Faith, being moved by the Proofs they offered of their Commiſſion. So far Judgment: Thus the Apoſtles believed *Chriſt* teaching *himſelf* to be the

Son

Son of God, their Judgment having firſt been convinced that God ſpoke by him; which Method appears more particularly in the Man born blind whom *Chriſt* our Lord cured, and who was thereby convinced that *God was with him*, taught by him; and in conſequence to that Conviction, having barely heard from *Chriſt*, that he was the Son of God, *he fell proſtrate and adored him*, not exacting any farther proof beyond his Word. After a full conviction that God ſpeaks by thoſe who Preach to us, there is no farther uſe of Reaſon, if we believe St. *Paul*, *but in order to the bringing into captivity all Underſtanding in obedience to Faith.* 2 Cor. 10. Niſi Dominus eſſet cum illo.

Defence f. 7, 8. If my Senſe and Reaſon will ſerve me to find out an Infallible Church, it is a little ſevere to *renounce it* when I come there.—The Apoſtles were as Infallible as the Church can pretend to be now, yet 1 Epiſt. John 4. 1. *Believe not every Spirit, but try the Spirits, if they be of God.* 1 Cor. 10. 15. *I ſpeak to wiſe Men, judge you what I ſay.* And *Acts* 17. 11. we have this particular Commendation of the *Bereans*, that *they were more noble than thoſe of* Theſſalonica, *in that they received the Word with all readineſs of mind, and ſearched the Scriptures daily to ſee whether what they heard, were conformable thereto or no.*

Anſwer. Do I renounce my Reaſon, when I embrace what my Reaſon hath convinced me to be *infallibly true?* Sure, Sir, you have too much Senſe, not to own this to be a ſenſleſs Poſition. But let us apply it to another Caſe. When a *Proteſtant* is convinced, and that, if you pleaſe, infallibly, that *the Word of God in the Bible delivers a Truth*, and his Reaſon hath convinced him of it, is he not to abandon whatever Reaſon can object againſt the Myſtery? If you ſay he is not, then a Man *may doubt of the truth of Gods Word.* A very Chriſtian *Proteſtant* Principle! If you ſay he is, then 'tis not ſevere, but moſt reaſonable, to renounce Reaſon when it oppoſes it ſelf to a Truth infallibly Preached, and received from an Authority acknowledged Infallible. As for the three Texts, I have before ſhewed how the *Firſt* is wreſted from its plain natural Senſe to the oppoſite. The *Third* is againſt him; for the *Bereans received* (Firſt) *the Word with all readineſs of mind, and* (then) *ſearched the Scriptures*, to ſee in them thoſe Texts which the Apoſtles uſed to convince the ſtubborn, and ſo do Catholics.

tholics. The *Second* is neither directly nor indirectly to the purpose: For St. *Paul* having brought a *Reason* why they were to abstain from such Meat and Drink as was offered to Idols, to wit, that since they did partake of the true Sacrifice of *Christ*'s Body and Blood, they could no more use what was Sacrificed to Idols, than serve at two opposite Altars, and adore the true God and the false ones, he asks them, Whether *this Reason is not convincing?* Now I would know whether a Supreme Judge (much more an infallible one) doth disclaim his own Power, because he offers evident Reasons for the Sentence he gives, and shews the Parties obstinacy, that should refuse to submit to them? As for those words, *As to wise Men I speak*, the honest Footman little understands the meaning of them; it being the Language of the Primitive Church, when any thing was touched concerning the great Sacrament of our Blessed Lord's Body and Blood, not to publish that high Mystery, but to refer to the private Instruction about it, which was given after Baptism, and never trusted to the Catechumens: an evident Proof, that in this Sacrament there was a high Mystery beyond the Faith in Christ our Redeemer, as Saviour of the World, and Food of our Souls by his Passion, without which no one was admitted to Baptism. Thus St. *Augustin* ever expressed himself in this Subject: *The Faithful know what I mean, those understand me that have been Christned.* Thus *Origen* and St. *Chrysostom* before him, and St. *Paul* himself: I speak to you more boldly of this Mystery, as to the wiser and more fully taught. Pray, Sir, leave off Licensing such wretched Trifles, and such wonderful wrested Texts, or never expect there should be any Answer returned to them; tho' how far this Motive will prevail with you, I have some small reason to doubt.

Norunt fideles, norunt qui Initiaati sunt. *In Ps.* 39. & 33. & *Ps.* 109. *Hom.* 42. *c.* 4. *l.* 50. *Hom. Orig. in Levit. Hom.* 9. *Chrys. Hom.* 27. *in Gen. Hom.* 5. *ad Antioch, &c.*

Preserv. f. 21. *We have as much assurance of every Article of our Faith, as you have of the Infallibility of your Church*; First, *because we are in general assured, that the Scriptures are the Word of God.*

Answer f. 5. This is the great Point indeed, which if a *Protestant* loses, he loses all: For, 'tis certain and evident, that the *Catholic* hath the same assurance for each Article of his Faith proposed by the Church, which he hath of the Churches

Churches infallibility, (as I have the ſame certainty of all that my Friend ſays to me, which I have that he ſpeaks nothing but certain truth.) He proves it firſt, *becauſe he is in general aſſured that the Scriptures are the Word of God*; Hitherto there holds ſome parity though but lame; but ſuppoſe it were entire, the Concluſion would be this, *Catholics are as certain of the ſenſe of Scripture as* Proteſtants *are that they have the Letter*; whence it follows demonſtratively, that when *Proteſtants* differ *in the ſenſe* from *Catholics*, they have leſs aſſurance for it than *Catholics*, who have always the ſame aſſurance *for the ſenſe* as *Proteſtants* have for *the Letter*.

Defence, *f.* 6. and 7. You are Judges in your own Caſe (about infallibility) ——We have the concurrent teſtimony of all Churches, that we have thoſe Canonical Books.----But let us ſuppoſe a while, that your Church were infallible, what greater certainty (*for that is the point you know which the Doctor was upon*) have you of it, than we have of any particular Point of Faith? as for the certainty of Reaſon and Argument, That we have, and would fain ſee you ſhew more. What we believe is according to Scripture, and doth not Contradict either Senſe or Reaſon, nor any other Principle of Knowledge.

Anſwer. Never was a ſtarved Cauſe ſo pitifully defended: No wonder a *Footman* only doth not bluſh to appear in its Defence; the Learned and judicious Gentlemen of the *Temple* had each of them too much Honor, Conſcience, and Wit, and therefore none of them would Patronize ſo wretched a Cauſe, and ſupport ſuch weak Contradictions as the Excellent Maſter of the *Temple*, (ſo the Preface-maker calls him) had blundered out. Pray Sir review this laſt Diſcourſe, bluſh that your Licenſe Authoriſes it, and hereafter have ſome care of your Reputation, and ſet not your Name to ſuch Stuff. This is the Caſe: on one ſide, there is ſuppoſed an Infallible Interpreter of the Chriſtians great Law-Book; (for thus Dr. *Sherlock* ſtates the Caſe) on the other are ſome men, (far the greater part unlearned and weak) who allow not any ſenſe to this Book, which ſeems to them *to Contradict either (their) Senſe or Reaſon, or any other Principle of (their) Knowledge*. And I am asked whether I proceed more prudently

dently in receiving the ſenſe of the Law from that Interpreter (which is actually ſuppoſed infallible) or in proceeding by the ſecond method. Sir, if you are ſo weak or wilful, as not to declare that I have a greater certainty in ſubmitting to that infallible Interpreter, your Counſel is not worth the asking, and I appeal to that of the judicious Gentlemen of the *Temple*. But I muſt not omit the untruth couched in thoſe words, *We have the Concurrent Teſtimony of all Churches, that we have thoſe Canonical Books*; For no part of the *Catholic* Church, no part of the *Greek Sciſmatic* Churches, own the ſame Canon of Scripture-Books which you do.

Preſervative, Ibid. *In particular we are aſſured that the Faith which we profeſs is agreeable to Scripture.*

Anſwer, fol. 5. If he means they have the ſame Proofs for this, which Catholics have for the infallibility of the Church, that is, for the Continued Being of that Church, which aſſures us that She is infallible in directing us, (for a Church Erring in ſo Fundamental a Point, would ceaſe to be the Church of Chriſt) then, it is evidently faſe, ſince each Chriſtian in this Age, hath the ſame Evidence of Her being the Church of Chriſt, and of Her teaching all Truth, and conſequently of Her being (as She declares) infallible in thus teaching, which he hath of Chriſt, to wit, the ancient Propheſies, thoſe of Chriſt himſelf; his Miracles, and the Miracles wrought in that Church, according to the Promiſes of Chriſt, beſides the Converſion of Nations to Chriſtianity, *&c.* Theſe things *Proteſtants* do not ſo much as pretend unto, as Proofs of their particular Senſe in Interpreting Scripture.

Defence, fol. 10. This is a pretty Conceit, the *infallibility of the Church*, that is to ſay, *the Being of the Church*; can't a Church be without being infallible. ——We have heard much of Miracles, but could never ſee any.

Anſwer. Do you allow ſuch Anſwers Sir, that have ſo little of Senſe and leſs of Piety? Can a Church remain the Church of Chriſt, and yet teach her ſelf to be infallibly guided by the Spirit of Chriſt, whil'ſt ſhe is abandon'd to the Spirit of Error, and that ſo far as Idolatry, and the Evacuating of the Paſſion of Chriſt? Are we come to own that

Herod

Herod might well be excuſed from believing in Chriſt, becauſe *he had heard much of his Miracles, but could never ſee any?* Well Sir, when you Licenſe ſuch an other Diſcourſe, add to your Titles that of *a Chriſtian*, that we may think you are one.

Preſervative, fol. 23. *If you muſt not uſe your Reaſon and private judgment, then you muſt not by any Reaſons be perſuaded to condemn the uſe of Reaſon.*

Anſw. f. 5. I never heard ſo much, and ſo little of Reaſon. ——All he ſays, might with equal weight be ſaid by a ſick Man, who diſſuaded from chooſing his own Remedies, and deſired to ſend for a skilful Doctor, ſhould anſwer, *'Tis impoſſible by Reaſon to perſuade me not to uſe my Reaſon, in governing my ſelf by Reaſon as my own Reaſon teaches me, which would be to Condemn Reaſon, and yet be guided by your Reaſon, or the Doctor's Reaſon.* Such a Diſcourſe would prove the Sick party at leaſt ſomewhat light-headed: What 'tis a Symptom of in Dr. *Sherlock* I will not be poſitive.

Defence, f. 11. Is this Sick Man perſuaded to renounce his Reaſon, or rather is it not that he ſhould ſubmit his judgment (not renounce his Reaſon) in that caſe to that Perſon whom he hath all the reaſon in the world to believe hath better knowledge, and underſtanding of thoſe things which are to be uſed for his recovery than himſelf? And all this while methinks he is governed by Reaſon, though he doth not think fit to truſt his own skill. —— But this bears no compariſon, Religion is, or ought to be the Concern of all.

Anſwer. The *Footman* prevaricates here, or is aſhamed of his Maſter's groſs Sophiſtry, and will not ſtand by it. 'Tis Dr. *Sherlock* who pretends that a Catholic by following an infallible Guide *renounces his Reaſon*; I contend that all the while *he is governed by Reaſon*, and chiefly, becauſe that in a matter of that Concern, *he thinks not fit to truſt his own skill:* which God hath as often declared to be too weak in any private perſon, as he hath declared he would give to all, ſuch Paſtors and Teachers as ſhould guide them, and Commanded each to repair to them, to be guided by them. But Religion is or *ought to be the Concern of all*, a wiſe Obſervation! So is, or ought to be each ones health, and the preſervation of his life:

life: as therefore each one ought to adviſe with a good Doctor concerning his Health, a good Lawyer for the preſervation of his Fortune; ſo, and much more with a good Guide, and (ſince it can be had) an infallible one, for the ſecuring of his Souls eternal happineſs: the Practice of Religion is the duty of all; but the teaching it, of thoſe Doctors whom God hath appointed to that end, as St. *Paul* teaches us *Eph.* 4. is not this Sir, a moſt evident truth?

Preſervative, f. 25. *Thou ſhalt Worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve*; is ſuch a plain and expreſs Scripture, that no reaſon can juſtifie the Worſhip of another Being.

Anſw. f. 6. A rare Conſequence! to Infer a Negative for an Affirmative Antecedent, that bears no oppoſition with it. 'Tis like this, *a Subject muſt love his King, and pay Allegiance to him alone*; therefore no Reaſon can juſtifie the love of a Man for his Wife, or of a Child for his Father. St. *Auguſtin* drew from that very Text the contrary Concluſion, he takes off all blame from *Abraham*, who is ſaid in *Geneſis* to have *Adored* or *Worſhipped* the People of the Land, *becauſe 'tis obſervable* (ſays the Holy Doctor) *That in the Commandment 'tis not ſaid thou ſhalt Worſhip God alone*, as it is ſaid, and him alone thou ſhalt ſerve; which in *Greek* is λατρεύσεις, *for ſuch a ſervice* (of Latria) *is given to God alone.*

Q. 61. in *Gen.*

Defence, f. 12. *What a delicate piece of Sophiſtry is here? The Commandment is to ſerve God only*, which ſervice we muſt of neceſſity underſtand to be that which is Divine, but Worſhip is ſo. ----Therefore the Text is plain againſt the Worſhip of any other but God.

Anſw. All that is plain in this Anſwer is, that men neceſſarily want a Guide in the interpreting of Scripture, and that an infallible one alſo, for ſuch is the pride of ſome men, that even an ignorant *Foot-man* (as you ſee) thinks he underſtands the Bible better than the Holieſt and moſt Learned of Doctors S. *Auguſtin*, and what reaſon teaches of the Service of God better than the moſt enlightened Patriarchs. *Abraham* Worſhips men: S. *Auguſtin* declares that the Commandment hath nothing againſt it, there being an inferior Worſhip, which is far below Divine Service: but the *Proteſtant* Doctor

ctor teaches his *Footman* to aver, that *all Worſhip* (ſo he ſhould have ſaid to have ſpoken ſenſe) *is Divine*, that the Text is plain againſt the Worſhip of any other but God. How likely is it they ſhall by their own judgment and reaſon underſtand the Bible, who cannot conſtrue right, the Commandments, no, not the firſt of them! and if Dr. *Sherlock* and his *Footman* underſtand right the firſt Commandment, St. *Auguſtin* did not. Do you not bluſh Sir, to Licenſe the boldneſs of ſuch ignorant Pride?

Preſervative, f. 26. *Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf any graven Image.* ----Is ſo expreſs a Law againſt Image-Worſhip, that no reaſon muſt be admitted for it.

Anſw. f. 6. What if you be told that the *Jews* may perhaps have had a Command of making no graven Image, *&c.* yet this being a poſitive Law, and not renewed in the Goſpel, doth not oblige us: will this Reaſon be admitted of? *No, no reaſon*; and yet you have no other reaſon for paſſing by as Expreſs a Law of Sanctifying *Saturday*. What if it be rejoyn'd that only the making *to themſelves* (by private Authority, making that to be which is not, a Statue for Example, which of its nature is the repreſentation of a Man, or a Calf, to be to them a true God) an *Idol to adore it*, which divine Worſhip thus miſapplyed is forbidden. Cannot this Reaſon be heard? No, then *Belezeel* by Gods direction and Command making ſeveral likeneſſes of things on Earth below, and in Heaven above; *Salomon* placing ſuch in the Temple, ſinned againſt the firſt Commandment (for the *making* of ſuch is as diſtinctly forbidden as the *Adoring*; So if a Law thus ſays, *Thou ſhalt not carry any Arms, thou ſhalt not ſtrike:* the carrying of Arms would be as directly againſt the Law as the ſtriking) ſo do all Painters and Carvers, and all our *London* Merchants that hang out a Sign-poſt. The truth is, what ſenſe they put on any Text, is the expreſs Law againſt which *no reaſon muſt be heard*, ſo they challenge to themſelves *that infallibility* which they ſo ſturdily deny to the *Church of God*.

Defence, f. 13, 14. 'Tis held on all hands, that the keeping of the Seventh day was *Figurative*, and ſo aboliſhed at the death of Chriſt; but as far as it was Moral, namely, that *a*

Seventh Day ſhould be kept, that ſtill remains. Beſides, Chriſt and his Apoſtles were Authors of this change; Chriſt as he roſe on that day, ſo he uſually did appear on that day to his Diſciples; and Scripture maintains the Celebration of it by the conſtant practice of the Apoſtles, *Acts* 20. 7. 1 *Cor.* 16. 21.

Anſw. We have four untruths in very few lines. The *firſt*, that 'tis agreed on all hands, that the keeping of the Seventh day was *Figurative*; all that underſtand Scripture right, ſay the contrary, to wit that it was not a meer Shadow of a thing to come (as *Figurative* ſpeaks) but a Memory of the paſt and never to be forgotten benefit of the *Creation*, from the work whereof God reſted on that day, and (ſays *Moſes*) *bleſſed the ſeventh day*. 'Tis a ſecond Untruth then, that the Moral part of it was only the keeping *a ſeventh day*, and that Chriſt our Lord altered it. 'Tis an untruth that Chriſt our Lord *uſually* appeared on that day to his Apoſtles, for *Acts* 1. 3. S. *Luke* aſſuresus he appeared every day to them: How St. *Pauls* meeting at *Troas* with many in the participation of the Sacraments, and diſputing till Midnight, it being the Eve of his departure, or his *ſubſcribing his Epiſtle with his own Hands*; (for theſe are the two Texts produced) is a Proof that the Scripture maintains the conſtant practice of the Apoſtles, of keeping *Sunday* Holy; I leave it to you Sir, to make out the truth of it.

Perdies quadraginta apparens Eis. *Act.* 1. 3. *Act.* 2. 7. Salutatio mea manu *Pauli* 1 Cor. 16. 21.

Defence, *f.* 14. 'Tis ſufficient (with Catholics) to ſubmit to an infallible Guide, *and* that too if he declares as the Council of *Conſtance* did *Concerning the Euchariſt, that notwithſtanding our Lord did Inſtitute it in both kinds, and the Apoſtles ſo celebrated it, yet now it ſhould not be ſo.* But for us *Proteſtants*, we cannot think that any Reaſon can be ſufficient to lay aſide an Expreſs Text.

Anſw. The meaning of theſe words as they lay here, is to perſuade the Readers, that the Council of *Conſtance* did own that Chriſt did Inſtitute or order, that the Sacrament ſhould be taken by all in both kinds, and that in the Apoſtles time it was ever ſo taken: yet that by the Church Authority it was ordered it ſhould hereafter be otherwiſe: If the Honeſt *Footman* means not ſo, and would not have all to believe ſo, there

there is no ſenſe at all in this his Inference, *That* Proteſtants *cannot think that any reaſon can be ſufficient to lay aſide an expreſs Text.* But in this ſenſe 'tis *a moſt outragious Calumny*, and though a *Footman's* ignorance may be excuſed, yet with what face Sir, can you pretend to judge of Books and Licenſe them, if you are in the ſame groſs Error; or if wilfully and wittingly you Licenſe ſuch impudent Slanders, againſt the whole Churches Repreſentative, what Libels, and Lampoons, are you not qualified and diſpoſed to Licenſe? Theſe are the words of the Council, *Although Chriſt did Inſtitute this Venerable Sacrament after Supper, and did adminiſter it to his Diſciples under both the kinds of Bread and Wine; yet notwithſtanding, the Authority of the Sacred Canons, the laudable and approved Cuſtom of the Church hath obſerved, and obſerves, that this Sacrament ought not to be Conſecrated after Supper, nor received by the Faithful not faſting, but in caſe of ſickneſs, and ſuch other neceſſity, as the Canon Law and the Church admit, or allow of. And ſo this Cuſtom, to avoid ſome dangers and ſcandals, hath been reaſonably brought in; that, although this Sacrament in the Primitive Church was received by the Faithful under both kinds, ſince that it ſhould be received by thoſe who Conſecrate (Prieſts) in both kinds, by the Laity only under the appearance of Bread. Becauſe we are firmly to believe, and in no way to doubt, that the entire Body and Blood of Chriſt is truly contained as well under the ſpecies of Bread, as under that of Wine.* Behold the Council declares, that it owns it no part of the Inſtitution, that the Sacrament be taken under both kinds, no more than that it be taken at Night after Supper, *&c.* All theſe being but Circumſtances belonging to that Diſcipline, which wholly depends on Church Authority, and is alterable at any time when there is reaſon for it. And indeed, if this be a Crime *which* Proteſtants *cannot be capable of*, how comes it to paſs that your Congregations receive your Sacrament *kneeling, faſting, in the Morning, in the Church, notwithſtanding the Inſtitution of Chriſt.* Own Sir, own Candidly this inſinuation to have been a Calumny.

Decreta Concil Conſ. Dec. 4.

Confici.

Preſervative, f. 45. *No Argument from the neceſſity of a thing, muſt be admitted to prove it is.* (*V. G.* 'Tis propoſed to You that) *If there be no infallible Judge, there can be no cer-*

tainty of Faith: though it be true, and you think it to be true, you muſt not allow this Conſequence, therefore there is one; ſuch Arguments do not prove that there be ſuch a Judge, but that there Ought to be.

Anſw. f. 6. This is not only to miſ-uſe human Reaſon, but to deny Wiſdom and Reaſon in God. *Alphonſus* the Royal Mathematician, was ever look'd on as guilty of a horrid Blaſphemy, for having ſaid, That *he thought he could have ordered ſome things better than God did at the firſt Creation:* 'Tis one of as deep a die to think, that God *ought* to have done, what we believe *he hath not done.*

Defence, f. 15. The Doctor ſays, fol. 44. *We ſhould never admit any Arguments merely from the uſefulneſs, conveniency, or* ſuppoſed *neceſſity of any thing to prove it is.* Now the Anſwerer leaves out *ſuppoſed*, and ſo makes that *abſolute* which was *conditional.*----*If I thought* (ſays Dr. *Sherlock*) *all this were true, as I believe not a word of it is, (that if there be not an infallible Judge, there can be no certainty in Religion) I ſhould only conclude, that it is great pity that there is not an infallible Judge Inſtituted by Chriſt. But if you would have me conclude from theſe Premiſſes.* Ergo, *there is an infallible Judge of Controverſies, I muſt beg your pardon for that, for ſuch Arguments as theſe do not prove that there is ſuch a Judge, but only, that there ought to be one, and therefore I muſt Conclude no more from them. Indeed, this is a very fallacious way of Reaſoning, becauſe what we may call uſeful, convenient, neceſſary, may not be ſo it ſelf: and we have reaſon to believe it is not ſo, if God have not appointed what we think ſo uſeful, convenient, and neceſſary*, &c. And now I would fain know who it is that denies Wiſdom and Reaſon in God.

Anſw. It is a pleaſant way of Anſwering in the Defence of a Perſon accuſed to have offended againſt the firſt Principles of Reaſon and Reſpect, to ſay that he hath ſpoken wiſely, and dutifully elſewhere: yet ſo Anſwers our *Footman*, if it be an Anſwer, meerly to add what is not blamed in an Author, to what is blamed. Dr. *Sherlock* ſays well in adviſing us to believe that not to be neceſſary, which we know God hath not appointed, therefore I did not touch, or reflect on that ſaying: but I ſay that the advice he gives to one *who*

ſuppoſes

ſuppoſes there is a *neceſſity* of any thing towards the Eternal Salvation of Chriſtians, *That tho' he believe it true, yet he infers not*, Sure then God hath beſtowed it, Chriſt hath obtained it for us; but rather, *God ought to have done it, Chriſt ought to have obtained it; but I do not therefore believe he hath.* This Advice, I ſay, is much more injurious to Gods Mercy and Wiſdom, than the Saying ſo much blamed by all Chriſtians in *Alphonſus*; the Salvation of Mankind being the ultimate Work of God towards his own Glory. Whether this Charge be not juſt, and Dr. *Sherlock* teach not this Doctrin in the words cited by the Anſwerer, in the Caſe of one who *ſuppoſes that there can be no certain Faith in a Chriſtian*, (and ſuch a Faith Chriſt exacts in all, by St. *Paul* and St. *James*, &c.) *without an infallible Guide, and who believes it to be true*; I leave it, Sir, to your obſervation.

Principles of Dr. Sherlock, *which make void all Faith.*

Preſerv. f. 79,80. *Suppoſe the* Proteſtant *Faith uncertain, how is the Cauſe of the Church of* Rome *the better? Is* Thomas *an honeſt Man becauſe* John *is a Knave.*

Anſwer. If *Thomas* and *John* be accuſed *ſeverally* of a Theft, and the ſtoll'n Goods be found with John, I conceive, tho' this prove not *Thomas* ſo aſſuredly an honeſt Man, yet an honeſt Jury would bring him in *Not-guilty*. That there is a true Faith, and conſequently a certain Rule of Faith, all Chriſtians acknowledge, *Proteſtants* on one ſide chooſe one Rule, (how differently ſoever they apply it) *Catholics* another: I conceive then, that if the *Proteſtant* Rule be proved uncertain, 'tis plain the *Catholic* Rule muſt be the certain one.

Defence f. 17. You muſt firſt prove that 'tis impoſſible for People to make to themſelves two wrong Rules.

Anſwer. I do not write againſt Dr. *Sherlock*'s Errors, but with this Suppoſition, that he holds what generally is called (if there be any ſuch fixed thing) the Doctrin of the Church Eſtabliſhed

Eſtabliſhed by the Law in *England*. I ſuppoſe he owns a Faith in *Chriſt*; That this Faith ought to be firm, certain, not wavering: for ſuch is the Faith S. *Peter* and S. *Paul* require of us; That this Faith altogether leans on Revelation; That the Scriptures are the Word of God; That if we underſtood the full extent of its true Senſe and Meaning, there would never be Error or Hereſie amongſt us: Hitherto we agree. Now the thing in queſtion is, by what Method we ought to come to that Knowledge, as far as it is neceſſary to a Chriſtian: and I ſay that all the Methods are reduced to theſe two Heads: That we are guided to the certain knowledge of what God hath revealed, either by a Knowledge communicated to each of us, or by a Knowledge communicated only to Guides apppointed to direct the reſt. If therefore *Proteſtants* are in the wrong, we are certainly in the right, as far as we are oppoſite to them. And beſides, ſince that all the poſitive Proofs that can be brought for the infallible Authority of Church-Teachers expreſs alſo in what Church they are, by evident Marks not to be found but in our *Catholic* Church, it follows, if the *Proteſtants* be in the wrong as to that Principle, we are certainly in the right as to each Point of our Religion, taught us by an unerring Interpreter.

Preſerv. f. 80. *This* (that the *Proteſtant* Faith is uncertain) *may ſignifie two things.* Firſt, *That the Objects of our Faith are uncertain, and cannot be proved by certain Reaſons.* Secondly, *That our Perſuaſion is wavering.*

Anſw. f. 7. Beſides the two mention'd, it ſignfies a *Third thing* alſo, to wit, That whatever Reaſons there may be for a thing, he who believes it, hath not for the Motive of his Belief thoſe certain Reaſons. There are, for Example, *certain Reaſons*, whereon to ground a Faith in *Jeſus Chriſt*; yet he that believes in Chriſt *meerly becauſe his Mother* (or a Miniſter) *hath taught him ſo to do*, hath a very *uncertain*, and no *Divine Faith.*

Defence f. 18. What can be the Gentleman's meaning, I cannot conceive, unleſs it be this, That becauſe *Proteſtants* take the Reaſon of their Faith from Scripture, and not from the Church of *Rome*, that therefore they can have no certain or Divine Faith: which if it be, I pity him; if it be not, I muſt deſire him to explain himſelf.

Anſwer.

Anſwer. The honeſt Footman is grown very tender-hearted. But is not this very plain, that altho' there be very good Reaſons for the belief of an Article of Chriſtian Religion, yet one that ſhould believe it on the account of ſome ſilly Motive only, ſuch as I cited, would have no Divine Faith? But how can this be applied to *Proteſtants, who take the Reaſons of their Faith from Scripture?* This I had ſhewed *Fol.* 6. but the *Footman* paſſes it by with this Anſwer only, *I ſhall ſay nothing to that Harangue, ſo often Anſwered by our Divines.* It ſeems he had forgot thoſe Anſwers, or was conſcious of their weakneſs. Thus I diſcourſed there: The *Catholics* prove, that an *uncertain* or wavering Faith, is *no Divine Faith*, which the *Proteſtants* can never have of any one Article of their Religion, becauſe they never can have a certain one. 'Tis eaſily proved, becauſe they cannot have an act of Faith of any one Article, till their Rule of Faith propoſes it, *i. e.* till they know certainly (by their private Reading and Judgment) what the Scriptures teach of it, not by ſome one Text or two, but by comparing all the Texts that treat of that Subject: for the Senſe of a ſingle Text (for Examp. *My Father is greater than I*) cannot be had, but by expounding it by other Texts on the ſame Subject. Till a *Proteſtant then* hath a certain knowledge, *Firſt*, that he hath all the Books of Holy Writ; *Secondly*, that all thoſe he owns for ſuch, were really written by inſpired Pens; *Thirdly*, that he hath a true and ſound Tranſlation (in caſe he underſtood not the Original Languages) and (in caſe he doth) a true Copy not altered by the Error or Malice of our Forefathers; *Fourthly*, (ſince the Letter kills) that he underſtands the true Meaning and Senſe of each Text, which relates to the Object of his Act of Faith? *Fifthly*, that he remember them all, ſo as comparing them, to ſee which be the *clearer* that muſt expound the *obſcurer*, and what is the *true reſult* of them all, (for any one which he underſtands not, or hath forgotten, may poſſibly be that one that muſt expound the reſt) he cannot have *one* Act of Faith. Now *Catholics* ſay, this is impoſſible to moſt, if not to all *Proteſtants*, (who are in each of theſe Points to Judge for themſelves, and not to ſubmit to any Authority where a Doubt ariſes) therefore *few*, or *no Proteſtants* can in their whole Life-time frame one Act of *Divine*

vine Faith concerning any *one Myſtery*, not that Scripture is not a very certain Rule, but becauſe they have choſen an uſeleſs (becauſe impoſſible) and *uncertain* way of applying it.

Preſervat. ib. We believe the Apoſtles Creed, and whatever is contained in the Writings of the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles. This is all we believe, and I hope they will not ſay theſe things are uncertain.

Anſwer. They are very certain, but not to any *Proteſtant*, whoſe Rule of Faith (conſidering the Method he applies it by) cannot make him certain of any one Article. But the pleaſant Anſwer which Juſtifies *Turk*, *Jew* and *Gentile*: For this is a Rule of Faith moſt ſufficient, according to Dr. *Sherlock*, (and a good Plea) *We believe all that God hath revealed, and nothing elſe, is not all that he hath revealed certain?* Here lies the Doctor's groſs Miſtake, that no one is an *Heretic* for not believing that what God hath revealed is true, 'tis impoſſible to fall into ſo mad an Hereſie: But *Heretics* are ſuch, for not believing him to have revealed what in effect he hath, tho' he hath given ſufficient Methods to come to the knowledge of it, if they would uſe them.

Defence. Do *Jews*, *Turks* and *Gentiles* believe all that is contained in the Writings of the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles?

Anſwer. No, Sir, nor you neither. If they believed all that God hath revealed, (as they pretend) they would believe all that is delivered in the Bible, which you pretend, but upon as little ground: What they think in their Judgment God hath revealed, they believe; what they think he hath not revealed, they disbelieve: that's their Rule of Faith, and 'tis yours, your own private Judgments being on both hands your Guides, and not any Authority Eſtabliſhed by Almighty God.

Preſervat. f. 81. If theſe things (which are believed by thoſe who take their Faith from the Bible interpreted by their own final Senſe) be not built upon certain Reaſons, their Infallible Church can have no certainty of the Chriſtian Faith.

Anſwer. Even this is moſt notoriouſly falſe, ſince ſhe is not Infallible by any Light of her own, but by the Guidance of the Spirit of Truth. Were not the Apoſtles, when they had once acknowledged *Chriſt* to be the Son of God, certain

of

of all he revealed to them, before he had given them *certain Reasons* for it? It were a blind Impiety to think so.

Defence f. 19. Was there (in that Case of the Apostles) a certain Faith without a certain Reason. An infallible Man must know things as they are, or else he is mistaken.

Answer. The *Footman* is very dull here, and cannot distinguish between a certain Reason moving me to believe him that speaks, and a certain Reason in the things that are delivered moving me to believe them. This Second Dr. *Sherlock* requires, saying, That *if these things which are believed, be not built upon certain Reasons, the Infallible* (*Church* seeing not any such Reasons) *can have no certainty of the Christian Faith.* An infallible Person must know what he knows as it truly is, but needs not see how or why it can be so.

Preservat. f. 82. *'Tis their common Argument, That there is a great variety among* Protestants, *and that they condemn one another with equal confidence and assurance.*

Answer. 'Tis one of your usual Artifices, to leave out always the pressing part of our Arguments: you should have added, *Tho' they use the same Rule of Faith, and apply it by the same Method.* Thus proposed, 'tis an unanswerable Argument against *your Rule of Faith*, and evidently proves it *uncertain.*

Defence f. 19, 20. Here the honest *Footman* sends me for an Answer to Dr. *Stillingfleet*, and bids me try my Skill upon him. Thus he delivers the Answer given to *J. S.* first Letter, and applied to the present Case; 'tis divided into five Propositions, which, to avoid repeating, I'll set down with the following Answer.

Answer. First, *Arithmetick* (says Dr. *Stillingfleet*) *prescribes a certain way by Addition and Substraction, to find out any Sum.* 'Tis granted. Secondly, *Therefore it must be such, that they who take it, shall arrive by it at the exact Sum.* Thats true also. Thirdly, *But two Men, who have made use of the same, way, differ at least a Hundred in casting up the Sum.* This is impossible, if they both really made use of that way as the words of Dr. *Stillingfleet* express: But 'tis very possible, if the meaning be, one of them doth not know the Rules of Arithmetick, but only thinks he knows them; or both know well the Rule, but one blundered, and set down one Figure for another.

Fourthly, *Therefore they who take only that way, cannot by it arrive at the certain Sum.* This is evidently falſe, and the contrary true; to wit, *Therefore they who take preciſely that way,* (and not another for it, erring in the Theory or the Practice) *cannot but arrive by it at the certain Sum.* But this following Concluſion might have been drawn from the Third Propoſition taken in its Second *moſt improper Senſe*, which Dr. *Stillingfleet* gives to it, *Therefore thoſe who err in the Knowledge, or miſs in the Application of the Rule of Arithmetick, tho' they believe never ſo much in their own Judgment that they know and uſe the Rule right, tho' they have uſed their beſt Endeavors, tho' they firmly believe they have caſt the Sum right, yet certainly they have miſſed, and are in the wrong.* This is the Concluſion which the Dean of *Pauls* ſhould have drawn, and then he might have concluded, *Still the Rule is certain to thoſe who uſe it right.* But is this the *Reverend Dr. Stillingfleet's full Anſwer*, and that in Dr. *Sherlock's* Caſe? Stupidity it ſelf would not own it: Tis an evident Demonſtration againſt Dr. *Sherlock's* Poſition, and Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Tenet. It proves evidently, that altho' Scripture be as infallible a Truth, and thereby *a Rule of Truth*, (for from Truth only Truth can follow) as any Rule of Arithmetick; yet as in one Caſe, if two caſting up an Account by the ſame pretended Rule, differ in the total Sum, this following Principle would not only be falſe, but alſo after ſuch a trial moſt abſurd and ſenſleſs. *Every one is bound in reaſon to believe the Account he hath caſt up, to be right, if he hath a Book of Arithmetick by him, hath read it, believes he underſtands it, and hath uſed his beſt Endeavors to follow it.* So is this like Principle, which Dr. *Sherlock* and all his Party ſtand for: *If two Men have the Bible, read it, endeavor to underſtand it, and believing they do, draw from the ſame Scriptures two different Concluſions, two oppoſite Articles of Faith, both are bound to ſtand to their private Judgment, and to believe themſelves in the right, tho' all the World ſhould accuſe one or both of them in lieu of the true pretended Rule, to have uſed a falſe one.* But let us ſuppoſe farther, that an eminent Maſter of Arithmetick ſhould ſhew to one of theſe Men where he erred againſt the true Rule of that Science, where he miſplaced a cypher, otherwiſe than the Rule directs; that this Man in lieu of ſubmitting, ſhould appeal to his Book of

Ex vero non niſi verum.

of Arithmetick, by the which alſo the other teaches, and the Diſpute ſhould be carried on by the one ſaying the Book teaches and directs thus, whilſt the other as ſturdily pretended it teaches and directs otherwiſe. In this Caſe were it a reaſonable Principle, *Both muſt ſtand to their private Judgment in Interpreting of the Book, and well they may, for the Rule is certain, which both follow.* Never did Man give a fairer and eaſier Victory to an Adverſary, than Dr. *Stillingfleet* doth to his, by this *Simile*. The dulleſt School-Boy will eaſily diſcern the Dean of *Paul's* patent *Paralogiſm*, whereby he compares the *written Word* of God to the Rule it ſelf of Arithmetick; whereas the natural and only true Compariſon is, of the *Book or Letter of Scripture* with the Book of Arithmetick; the true Senſe of Scripture with the Rule of Arithmetick.

A Right-Line-Rule and a *Square* are *the Rule* of a Carpenter; ſuppoſe a Carpenter had a bent and crooked Rule, and that what he calls his *Square* opened at an *acute* or *obtuſe* Angle; this Man working by theſe, would certainly make his Work wrong. I ask you now where the Fault would be? Certainly in *his Rule*, in his (ſuppoſed) *Square and Rule*. But is not a Carpenter's Rule exact? Yes, *a Carpenter's*, but not *this Carpenter's*; the Rule he pretends to follow is moſt Juſt, *the Rule* which he actually follows is moſt falſe and erroneous: And if many Carpenters pretending to work by a Right-Line and Square, applying them the ſame way, did all differ in the Irregularity of their Work, it would be evident they had a *falſe Rule*; for that's ones *Rule*, not that he *pretends to have*, but what he actually works by. Now to apply this to our Caſe: The *Word of God* is not the Letter, but the true Senſe of the Bible; for the knowledge of Scripture, as St. *Hierom* obſerves, *conſiſts not in the Reading, but the Underſtanding of it.* The Rule of Faith then, is the Senſe of the Letter of Scripture; The *pretended Rule* is the *true Senſe* of Scripture; The real Rule that Chriſtians uſe, is that Senſe of the Letter of Scripture by which they ſquare their Faith: for that is any ones real Rule, by which he in reality acts. The true Senſe of Scripture is a *certain Rule*; The Senſe given to the Letter of Scripture is a moſt uncertain, and frequently a wrong Rule; The Rule Proteſtants *pretend* unto, is a certain infallible Rule, for *Truth* never miſguides:

Scripturæ non in legendo ſed intelligendo conſiſtunt.

But *their Rule* of Faith is the Senſe which each Man's private Judgment gives to the Letter of Scripture; for they ſquare their Faith by it, & believe according to the ſame: The Letter of Scripture is their Material Rule, as a piece of Wood is the Material *Square* of a Carpenter; their *application of Senſe to this Letter* is that which makes their real and Formal Rule, as the ſtreightneſs or crookedneſs of a Rule, is the *true Rule* of the Carpenter that uſes it. 'Tis againſt this I write, and againſt Dr. *Sherlock*'s Principle, that tho' ſeveral Men uſing the ſame Method of making Rules, find and own that their ſeveral Rules make different Lines; yet it follows not (ſays he) that the Rules they work by are not *true*, nor their Methods of making themſelves a Rule, erroneous.

Preſervat. f. 83, 84. *Were all Proteſtants of a mind, would their Conſent and Agreement prove the certainty of their Faith?*

Anſwer f, 7. Not at all; but 'tis a moſt ridiculous Inference of yours, *This is the ſame Rule, and their Diſagreement proves not their uncertainty.* All Union is not an Argument of the Spirit of God, for People may combine to do ill; But St. *Paul* aſſures us, *Diſunion* and *Diſſention* is a certain Mark of the abſence of the Spirit of God.

Defence f. 21. You ſhould have added in ſome, not in all the diſagreeing Parties. If the Queſtion be put amongſt a company of Men to go rob ſuch a Houſe, is it a Mark of the abſence of the Spirit of God in thoſe which do not agree to that Wickedneſs.

Anſwer. Certainly this honeſt *Footman* is hired to write as wide as may be from Reaſon, that in Compariſon with it Dr. *Sherlock*'s Errors may appear tolerable. I ſpeak of People led into Diſunion by the *ſame Principle*, which from thence I conclude to be no good one: And I pray, thoſe who refuſe to go and rob the Houſe, do they act in this Refuſal by the ſame Principle by which others are moved to the Robbery? If they be, (for Example, out of Spite) tho' their Refuſal be juſt and good, their Motive or Rule they act by (and of that only I ſpeak) is ſtark naught.

Dr. Sherlock's *Principle, which makes void all Scripture-proof.*

Preſervative, fol. 72. *IF a Myſtery appears againſt Senſe and Reaſon, we muſt have a Scripture proof as cannot poſſibly ſignifie any thing elſe; or elſe it will not anſwer that Evidence which we have againſt it, Senſe and Reaſon proving it naturally impoſſible.*

Anſw. f. 7. A Text which cannot poſſibly have an other ſenſe doth not leave it in any ones liberty who owns Scripture to be an *Heretic*, therefore the Church produced no ſuch Texts againſt the *Arians* or *Neſtorians* (to whom the Myſteries of the Trinity, and of Chriſts Human and Divine Nature in one Perſon, appeared againſt Senſe and Reaſon) whence it evidently follows, that according to Dr. *Sherlock* the *Arians* and *Neſtorians*, were bound not to believe the Trinity, and Incarnation of Chriſt. A happy Miniſterial Guide, and well led ſuch as follow him.

Defence, f. 22. The *Trinity* and *Incarnation*, which the *Arians* and *Neſtorians* diſputed, they are Myſteries indeed, and might ſeem to be above Senſe and Reaſon, but they are not contrary to it. But that Tranſubſtantiation contradicts both, is plain.

Anſw. The *Footman* had better have minded his Maſters buſineſs, than to pretend an Anſwer, to what he doth not as much as underſtand. Certainly the Myſteries of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation*, are not againſt Senſe and Reaſon, but they did *appear* ſo to the *Neſtorians*, and *Arians*, and that is the Caſe, put by Dr. *Sherlock*: and therefore 'tis evident, that according to his Principle, *Arians* and *Neſtorians* were bound not to leave their Hereſies.

Dr. Sherlock's *Principle, making void all uſe of Councils and Fathers.*

Preſervative, fol. 73 AFter he hath reſpectively told us, *That Learned men may ſquabble about the Fathers*; he gives theſe Rules without which they be of no uſe. 1. We muſt know that *the Father is truly Author of the Book* (or the Council of ſuch a Decree.) 2. *That he was not corrupted by the ignorance or knavery of the Tranſcribers, while they were in the hands of the* Monks (and to make this impoſſible he aſſures us) *They not only pared their Nails, but alſo their very Habit and Dreſs, to fit them to the Modes of the time.* 3. *That the Father doth not in ſome other place Contradict what there he ſays.* 4. *That he did not alter his Opinion after.* That's to ſay, ſome of theſe requiſites, not being poſſibly to be known, no uſe is to be made of them.

Anſwer f. 8.

Defence, f. 23, 24. Theſe requiſites, that man that will build any thing upon their Authority muſt know, or elſe he may be miſerably miſtaken, yet this is not to deny any uſe of Fathers and Councils, for Learned men may diſpute about them.

Anſw. A rare Privilege granted to Learned Men, that they may diſpute about Fathers, and Councils, but not till they have reſolved ſome doubts firſt, which cannot poſſibly be reſolved. This is to ſport pretty pleaſantly, but not to anſwer.

Dr. Sherlock's *Principle, which makes void all uſe of Civil Charity, and Moral Juſtice to our Neighbor.*

Anſwer. fol. 8. IT lies in his laſt Chapter, in which he attempts in vain to colour the Miſrepreſentations which his Party hath ever been guilty of. It

It is when a mans Exterior Actions are naturally capable of a good and pious meaning, and he ever and clearly declares that it is *His*. Yet to faſten upon him another oppoſite deſign and meaning, taken from his oppoſers contrary Principle. Than which there cannot be a greater and more unjuſt *diſingenuity*, this he calls to *join* Proteſtant *Principles with* Popiſh *Practices*. For Example, to inſinuate, *That a Catholick thinks the bleſſed Virgin more Powerful in Heaven than Chriſt*; He tells us, that he ſays ten *Ave Maria's* for *one Lords Prayer*. And this though he knows, that the firſt half of the *Ave Mary* is in memory of, and thankſgiving for the Incarnation of Chriſt, and the other half asks of the Virgin, *only to pray for us* to Chriſt, which is all the Power we allow her in Heaven.

Defence, *p.* 24. The matter of Fact is true. —— Suppoſe he doth not think her more powerful than Chriſt, yet ſure he muſt think her more merciful, and ready to hear his Prayers.

Anſw. This is in lieu of excuſing his Maſters Malice and diſingenuity, meerly to make the Proverb Good, *like Maſter, like Man*. *Mary* her ſelf, her Merciful concern for us, her Prayers are an Effect and Gift of the Mercy of Chriſt. But to ſee how people will ſpeak in ſpight of Senſe, when they are reſolved to impugn Truth: how can it prove that I believe a perſon more merciful than another, becauſe I repeat oftner my inſtances and Petition. Naturally we call that a greater mercy which is ſooner moved, and yields to a ſingle addreſs. But the whole is a moſt falſe Calumny, as it inſinuates that our Church applies her Devotions more to our bleſſed Lady than to Chriſt. Our *Maſs*, our *Church Office*, (except now and then a ſhort Prayer of three or four lines) our Meditations, our Faſts, are all directed to God and Chriſt, from him only we expect the whole Mercy that muſt blot out our Sins, and the whole Goodneſs that muſt make us Eternally happy.

Preſervative, *f.* 89. The *Papiſt* believes it unlawful to commit Idolatry, and moſt damnable to Worſhip any Breaden God, which is ſpoke like a *Proteſtant*, but yet he pays Divine Adoration to the *Sacrament*, which is done like a *Papiſt*.

Anſw.

Answ. f. 8. This I call the most disingenuous Representation, and the most false Calumny imaginable, as a supposed and owned Truth; to wit, *That* Catholics *Worship the visible Species in the Eucharist.* A most impudent slander, no Catholic being guilty of it, no more than the Apostles of Worshiping and Adoring the Cloths of Christ, when they Adored him upon Earth.

Defence, f. 21. There is no mention made of Species, but the word is Sacrament.

Answ. This is what I called disingenuity. If he takes not Sacrament in the Catholic sense, therein lies his fraud, in Expounding by his opposite Principles, our Actions: and in the Catholic sense nothing hath a reference to his Accusation of a *Breaden God*, but the visible Species of Bread.

I concluded with this address to *Protestants*, in Dr. *Sherlocks* words, putting (as I owned) the word *Scripture* in the lieu of *Fathers*, to shew that according to his very way of Reasoning, the meer reading of Scripture, could not serve for an useful Guide at least to the far greatest part of *Protestants.* The Sentence is, as follows.

Preservative, f. 76. *Amongst Christians there is not one in a hundred thousand who understands all Scripture, and it is morally impossible they should, and therefore there must be certainly an easier and shorter way to understand Christian Religion, than this, or else the generality of mankind, even of profess'd Christians, are out of possibility of Salvation.* Think well on it, as you will answer at Gods Tribunal for the care you took of *the one only necessary*, the saving of your Souls, seek out that easier and shorter way, and walk faithfully in it.

Defence, f. 26, 27. We do not only say, but we find, that Scripture in all points necessary to Salvation, is plain and easie, so that we may run and read. 'Tis true, there are some Texts which we that are unlearned, cannot readily find the true sense and meaning of, but they are not such as immediatly concern Salvation; and we are not destitute of helps as to these, for we have learned and Religious Divines.

Answ. Is it not pleasant to say, that Scripture is plain and easie in all points necessary to Salvation: and yet to see that those

thoſe who uſe the ſame Method for the underſtanding of it, differ as much as may be in the belief of theſe Points? Is it not againſt plain Scripture, to ſay, that ſuch Texts as the *unlearned* cannot readily find the ſenſe of, are not ſuch as immediately concern Salvation, whereas Scripture teaches us, that there be Texts *which the unlearned wreſt to their own perdition.* Well, I am weary in following this *Footman*, running Extravagantly out of all Way, and Reaſon. Neither, Sir, have I any mind to add to this long Letter, any farther Advice adreſs'd to your ſelf: If the expoſing to your Eyes the Characters of the Books you Licenſe, doth not move you not to proſtitute ſo eaſily your Name to thoſe heaps of diſingenuous Cavils, ill-laid Calumnies, and monſtrous Miſrepreſentations, which you daily Licenſe; it ſhall be to me a ſufficient Note and Character of a Book not worth the reading, much leſs the Cenſuring, where ever I ſee you have opened it the Preſs, which will in part eaſe of an ungrateful and unneceſſary toil.

SIR,

Your Servant to all

Chriſtian Offices,

LEWIS SABRAN,

Of the Society of JESUS.

POSTSCRIPT.

THO' the *Preface* to Dr. *Sherlock's Defence* might very naturally have challenged to be firſt Anſwered; yet becauſe the *Defence* did attempt (tho' moſt vainly) to undermine the very Foundation of the Chriſtian Faith, that *Rock* of the *Catholic Church*, on which *Chriſt* our Bleſſed Lord raiſed it; whereas the *Preface* was ſtuffed chiefly with forged Calumnies againſt me, I thought it my Duty (and ever ſhall) to paſs by my own private Concerns, till I had vindicated the Church of God. Now, Sir, I come to my own Defence.

I find my Adverſaries Choler heated to the higheſt Ferment, becauſe I Anſwered the *Celebrated Preſervative*, an excellent Tract, ſays he, proved *ſo acceptable by the Univerſal Entertainment it met with*, in *a ſingle Sheet*, which he ſays was a ridiculous Anſwer to ſo great a Book. I omitted nothing, Sir, that even pretended to the appearance of an Argument; and if your *Celebrated Books* ſwell ſo with words, and prove void of Senſe and Reaſon, am I blameable for it? He ſhould have pointed at ſome pretended Proofs which I ſlighted to expoſe, or have praiſed me for not wearying my Readers with a dull Prolixity: But it ſeems we muſt copy theſe Men's Faults, or abide their Cenſure.

He tells us next, That *the Accuſations of Forgery, of Clipping of Texts, Fathers and Councils, Run high on both ſides; That the Reader hath this certain way of knowing where the Guilt lies; That the Church of* Rome *accuſes us, but do's not prove it; but our Men do not only accuſe them, but prove it upon them.* This is indeed ſomewhat material, and he inſtances upon *my Forgeries* on the one ſide, and thoſe that Dr. *Comber*, Author of the *Advice to Roman-Catholics*, is accuſed of on the other. I am content to joyn iſſue upon this matter; and having produced the Grounds on which theſe ſeveral Accuſations are bottom'd

bottom'd, I will leave the Deciſion to your and every unbiaſſed Reader's Judgment, having firſt owned *Forgery* to be the greateſt Mark of a bad Cauſe, and that even owned ſuch by thoſe who thus defend it. He produces againſt me three Letters, written, as he ſays, *by one of their Learned Writers*; in which no leſs than One and twenty ſuch Forgeries are proved upon me, and *Proteſtant*-like, becauſe I am *accuſed*, concludes me *guilty*, without taking the leaſt notice of my full Anſwers given to thoſe moſt falſe Calumnies; he and his *Learned Author* following both the old Advice, *Calumniare fortiter, aliquid adhærebit*; Do but Calumniate boldly, ſomething will ſtick of the Dirt you caſt. Firſt then, I will ſhew the confident Impudence of my Accuſer.

I Preached on the 25th of *Auguſt* laſt before his Sacred Majeſty at *Cheſter*, on the Converſion of St. *Auguſtin* from Hereſie and a looſe Life; and throughout that Sermon I laid out in the B. Saint's own words, thoſe miſtaken Reaſons that hindred him, and keep off preſent *Sectaries* from a due Reconciliation with the Catholic Church: I offered evident Motives taken from the ſame Saint's words, which obliged Him, and do as efficaciouſly exact from all *Proteſtants*, under pain of Eternal Damnation, (when a moſt dull Ignorance doth not excuſe them) to return to the Communion of that *one only Church*, which they profeſſed themſelves Members of at their *Baptiſm*. Thoſe unanſwerable Arguments of ſo great a Doctor moved many, to my knowledge, to a happy Imitation of ſo Learned a Saint; but they were too plain and ſolid to meet with even a ſeeming Anſwer from the boldeſt of their Mercenary Pens.

The only Trick left them, was by ſome ſlie Inſinuation, ſome Calumny, to divert the well-meaning Reader's Attention: and a Miniſter, better known by his *Forehead* than *Wit*, attempted it boldly in a *Poſtſcript*. He was however afraid of burning his Fingers with touching the *Sermon* it ſelf, but nibled at three Lines of the Introduction to it, a *Form of Prayer to the Bleſſed Virgin Mother of our Lord*, taken out of the *Thirty fifth Sermon* of S. Auguſtin *de Sanctis*: Then to ſupport himſelf with big words, he accuſes me of *Forgery* and *Diſingenuity*, not for citing any thing otherwiſe than it lay in that

Sermon, but becauſe, forſooth, this is not really St. *Auguſtin*'s Sermon, but a *Spurious Piece* unjuſtly Fathered upon him: Then he as inſolently triumphs, as a weak Enemy, who not daring to attack a Camp, ſhould brag of the Victory, becauſe he had moſt couragiouſly ſhot at random at an expoſed Centinel. Now, Sir, take a view of his Proofs, and of thoſe Forgeries he accuſes me of in the two Letters, which I writ in my own Defence. His Proofs were theſe.

Firſt the Title, *A Sermon on the Feaſt of the Aſſumption* doth not agree at all to any thing that is near *S. Auguſtin*'s time. There was then not only no Feaſt of the Aſſumption (therefore no Sermon could then be Preached on that Solemnity) but not even any belief of ſuch an Aſſumption.

This is a moſt weak pretence of a Proof: For, as I ſhewed, that *Day of Aſſumption*, when applied to any deceaſed Saint, ever ſignified in the Language of Fathers, *the Day of their Death.* I cited ſeveral Sermons made by the Fathers, as *S. Cyril*, *Amphilochius*, *Methodius*, made on our Lady's *Purification*, long before any *Solemnity* of it were obſerved in the Church of God: That *S. Hierom*, or an Author of the ſame Age, *William* of *Paris*, *S. Bernard*, made Orations on the *Aſſumption* of our Bleſſed Lady, altho' they doubted of her being aſſumed into Heaven in Body: That the Sermon in *S. Meliton*'s name, own'd for his in the Fifth Century, ſpake as fully on the real Aſſumption of our Bleſſed Lady, as any *Catholic* ever did ſince. And therefore it is evidently falſe, that there was no ſuch Belief in *S. Auguſtin*'s time. Farther I added, That, as *Nicephorus* witneſſes, *Juvenal* Patriarch of *Jeruſalem*, proved the truth of this Myſtery as now piouſly believed in the Catholic Church, to have been received of very ancient Tradition, and that in the preſence of *Marcion* the Emperor, in whoſe time was the Fourth General Council. Next I ſhew'd what a *Cheat* this Miniſter put upon his Readers, by inſinuating that the *Thirty fifth Sermon* I cited, ſpake not of the Bleſſed Virgins *Death*, but of her *Aſſumption* in the Senſe which that word now vulgarly bears; whereas the contrary is moſt evident, and is expreſſed in ſuch words as are found in all the ancient Writings of the Fathers on this Subject; to wit, *In theſe the World is honor'd by ſo great a Virgins departure; in what*

order

order or manner ſhe paſſed hence to Heaven, the Catholic Church doth no way recount, neither is her Body found on Earth, neither is her Aſſumption in the Fleſh (as it is read in the Apocrypha's) found in the Catholic Church. This is the true Opinion concerning her Aſſumption, that not knowing whether in her Body or out of it, (as the Apoſtle hath it) we believe her aſſumed above the Angels. Is it not evident from hence, that this Miniſter moſt falſly impoſed upon his Readers? To this Accuſation of mine he returns not a word of Anſwer; to my Proofs, only theſe inſignificant Triſles, That *Nicephorus* comes too late; That *S. Bernard* doubted of our Bleſſed Lady's Aſſumption in Body; That the firſt mention we find of *Meliton*'s Book was Sixty Years after *S. Auguſtin*'s time, when it was declared Apocryphal: Not a word to the Sermon under *S. Hierom*'s name, nor to any of my other Proofs.

His Second Proof was, That very lately ſome *Benedictin*'s at *Paris*, in their late Edition of *S. Auguſtin*'s Works, had caſt it into their *Appendix* as *Spurious*; and that they told us, that in their MSS. it wanted the Name of any Author; but that the *Louvain* Doctors told us, that in ſeveral Manuſcripts which they uſed in their Edition of *S. Auguſtin* this Sermon *de Sanctis* was intitled to *Fulbertus Carnotenſis*.

1. I Anſwered, That theſe were no Proofs, or where they have an appearance of a Proof, that 'tis grounded on a Miſtake. 'Tis no Proof at all on any ſide, that in many Manuſcripts there was *no Name* to the Sermon; this is ſelf-evident. 2. That it is evident this Sermon was not of *Fulbertus Carnotenſis*; for the Sermon I cited aſſures us, that the Church at that time taught nothing of the Corporal Aſſumption of the Virgin; whereas *Fulbertus* in his Sermon of the Nativity of the Bleſſed Virgin, teaches, *That Chriſtian Piety believed, that Chriſt raiſed glorioufly his Mother, and placed her above the Heavens.* This was an undeniable Proof, and therefore the Miniſter anſwers nothing to it: However, I added out of Courteſie, that 'tis no new thing that a Saint's Sermon ſhould in ſome Manuſcripts appear under other Names than their known Authors, the ſame having happened to ſeveral Sermons of *S. Chryſologus*, *S. Ambroſe*, &c. That *Syncletica*'s Life, the undoubted Work of *S. Athanaſius*, was in ſome ancient Manuſcripts intitled to *Poly-*

carp

carp the Anchoret. The Miniſter diſproves not any one of theſe Inſtances. To his vain Argument, that the Style of this Sermon did ſeem to differ from that of *S. Auguſtin*'s, (which is his private Opinion, and of few late Writers) I oppoſed the contrary Opinion of *S. Thomas Aquinas*, who owned this Sermon to be *S. Auguſtin*'s; that eminent Doctor, ſo well verſed in this Saint's Writings, that he was called *Auguſtinus Contractus*: a Doctor, to the defence of whoſe Doctrin, the greateſt part of Chriſtian Divines are ſworn. Was not this a very full Anſwer? Yet to ſhew how the *Louvain* Doctors owned the *Invocation of Saints* to have been *S. Auguſtin*'s Doctrin, I minded him, that they receive his *Eighteenth* Sermon *de Sanctis*, in which he ſpeaks thus, *Having received theſe our Vows by thy Prayers, obtain Pardon for our Sins.* ——*What we offer, let it by thee be pardonable. What we ask with a faithful Mind, let it become attainable; Receive what we offer, return us what we ask*, &c.

The *Laſt* Proof the Miniſter offers, and which he values moſt, is, That one *Iſidore* is quoted in that *Twenty fifth* Sermon *de Sanctis* thus: *Hence* Iſidore *obſerves it is uncertain by this Saying, whether the Sword of the Spirit is meant, or the Sword of Perſecution.* Now *Iſidore* of *Sevil* in his Book of the Life and Death of Saints, Chap. 68. hath theſe words: *Which indeed is uncertain, whether he meant the Sword of Martyrdom, or the Word of God, heavy and ſharp beyond any double-edged Sword.* 'Tis evident, ſays the Miniſter, this ſame *Iſidore* is cited in the *Thirty fifth* Sermon, which could not therefore be of *S. Auguſtin*'s compoſing, who lived Two hundred years before this *Iſidore.*

This indeed hath the face of a Proof; therefore I offered theſe following Reaſons, why the *Iſidore* quoted in the *Thirty fifth* Sermon, was not the *Iſidore* of *Sevil.* 1. In the *Thirty fifth* Sermon in debate, are theſe words: *In our time no Author among the* Latins *can be found, who treating of the Bleſſed Virgins Death, hath been poſitive and expreſs.* Now *S. Gregory of Tours*, being one of the moſt famous Authors of the Sixth Age, and having as fully and poſitively written of this *Aſſumption* as any ſince, the Author aſſuring, that no one amongſt the *Latins* had done ſo, could not be a Learned Biſhop that lived

lived after the Seventh Century; and therefore the *Iſidore* whom he cites, cannot poſſibly be *Iſidore of Sevil*. Again, the Sermon cited under the name of *S. Hierom*, and at leaſt as ancient as the Fourth General Council, and which was cited by the famous *Hincmar* Biſhop of *Rheims*, by *S. Odilo*, and others contemporaries with *Fulbertus*, could not have eſcaped his knowledge. As for the words of *Iſidore of Sevil*, they vary as much from thoſe that are cited in the *Thirty fifth* Sermon, as the words which expreſs the ſame ſenſe in *Epiphanius*, who writ before *S. Auguſtin*. Hence I inferr'd, that ſince we know many *Iſidores*, and famous before *S. Auguſtin*'s time, 'tis far more probable, that one of theſe was cited in the *Thirty fifth* Sermon, and therefore without any danger of *Forgery*, I might well cite a Sermon as *S. Auguſtin*'s, (eſpecially in a meer Introduction to a Sermon) which the greateſt Divine of the latter Ages, and whom moſt do follow in this, had cited, and that as a Proof in Arguing. All that is replied to this is, That the Author of the *Thirty fifth* Sermon looked upon *S. Gregory* as miſtaken. But can that allow him to ſay, that no body writ *Poſitively on that Subject*, meaning only that they were miſtaken? This is the Iſſue of that Controverſie which this *Preface-maker* ſtiles me *Famous for*: I leave it to your Judgment, Sir, whether my Defence doth not prove it a *Calumny* in the Miniſter who accuſed me, in citing this Sermon, of *Diſingenuous Forgery*. He knew well his weak Surmiſes, miſplaced by him for Arguments, could not make it out: therefore having eſpied in my Second Letter, that *I reſolved to take no farther notice of ſuch unknown Masks or Perſons who concealed their Names, that their Errors when baffled, their Calumnies when cleared, may not put them to the Bluſh*, he confidently puts out a Third Letter, without any the leaſt addition of a new Proof, and again conceals his Name, to ſecure himſelf from an Anſwer, which he knew I had publickly profeſſed I would not give, if he thus concealed his Name, and only repeated what I had Anſwered; then he moſt *diſingenuouſly* brags that I had dropt the Queſtion. Now, Sir, a full account of the Controverſie being thus given, obſerve the vain ſillineſs of the *Preface-maker*'s accuſing me of Forgery.

1. *The*

1. *The* 35th *Sermon of* S. Auguſtin, *a* Forgery.

2. *The* 14th *Sermon* de Sanctis, *a* Forgery.

3. *The* 18th *Sermon of* S. Auguſtin de Sanctis, *a* Forgery.

S. Hierom's *Sermon a* Forgery.

S. Meliton's *Book a* Forgery.

I have now proved how falſe this Charge is.

'Tis owned at all hands for *S. Auguſtin*'s, not diſproved or denied by my very Adverſary in his laſt Anſwer, who only complains that the Citation in the Margin did not lead him to it.

My very adverſary owns', that the *Louvain* Divines Printed it amongſt thoſe Works of *S. Auguſtin*, which they own for his, but not with an *undoubted Certainty*.

I expreſly cited it as a Sermon that went under *S. Hierom*'s Name, and therefore added, *Or an Author of the ſame Age*. Not a word hath been attempted to prove there was not ſuch a Sermon in that Age. Pray where lies the *Forgery?*

My words were, *A Sermon under S. Meliton's Name.* 'Tis evident there was ſuch an one by the very Cenſure of *Pelagius* in a Council above 1200 Years ago, when it was reckoned amongſt the *Apocrypha*, that is, of an Authority doubted of, and not aſſerted to its Author. Wherein lies this *Forgery?* But in one of my Letters it was Printed *Malion* for *Meliton*, tho' corrected in the next. Theſe Men are as wonderful Perſecutors of *Errata's*, as Dr. *Teniſon* of *Errors in Spelling*: But ſuch Trifles muſt be the Pageantry of theſe great Writers Atchievements; and thoſe, it ſeems, who at the end of their Books note the *Errata's* of the Print, own them-

themſelves guilty of great *Forgeries.*

The Story about Juvenal *and* Marcion, *a* Forgery.

And why? *Nicephorus*, who writ it, lived almoſt a thouſand years after S. *Auguſtin*, and was the firſt Hiſtorian found to have mentioned it. Doth not this prove me guilty of a great *Forgery* in citing *Nicephorus?*

S. Athanaſius *de Incarnatione, a* Forgery.

What Proof for it? Every man indeed hath owned it to be his Work; but the laſt Critick, one *du Pin*, hath lately queſtioned it, therefore a *Forgery.* Is not this a ſhameleſs Nonſenſe? *Luther* did not own S. *James*'s Epiſtle Canonical, therefore 'tis a *Forgery*, is as good an Inference.

A Prayer to the Virgin, not a ſyllable whereof was to be found there, a Forgery.

I cited to him the Leaf in his own Century-Writers, where the Place and Leaf in *Athanaſius*'s his Works are cited, to be found where the *Centuriators* quote them; yet this muſt be a *Forgery.*

S. Cyril's *Quotation falſifi'd, a* Forgery.

I proved evidently in my firſt Letter to you, Sir, that the Miniſter had egregiouſly falſified it, and that I had it right according to all the *Greek* and *Latin* Copies.

Nectarius *upon* Theodore, *a* Forgery.

In the ſame Letter I have convinced the Miniſter of his dull Ignorance, and taught him where to find that Sermon of *Nectarius*, but no Anſwer given me, no notice taken of mine, yet it muſt be a *Forgery.*

That the Prayers out of Methodius, Ephrem Syrus, Athanaſius, *S.* Leo, *are* Forgeries.

I cited not one of theſe, but told my Miniſter, I could cite from thoſe Authors, if need were, evident Inſtances of Praying to Saints. He, very wiſely, not ſo much as

knowing what and whence I would cite, declares they must needs be *Forgeries*; this *Preface-maker* adds confidently, that certainly they are so. Is not this a bold kind of Calumny?

S. Gregory Nazianzen's *Prayer to the Blessed Virgin, a* Forgery.

No Proof of this but the Minister's plain Assertion against the general Sense of the Learned World. Is not this a pleasant way of *proving upon us* Forgeries.

The Proof from S. Ambrose *is a* Forgery.

How is this proved? *I do not find* (says the Minister) *the Title of this Sermon in the INDEX, and I will not turn over five Tomes.* To ease him of the labor, I tell him 'tis the 14th Sermon, pag. 144. in the Fifth Tome of the *Paris* Edition of 1661. What Answer is returned me? None, but *No matter*, says this *Preface-maker*. It was called a *Forgery* by the Minister, it must be still a *Forgery*.

The Proof from S. Gregory Nazianzen's *Jambicks, is a* Forgery.

Boldly said: is it proved? Not one single word by either of the Ministers; but as a Ministers Oath lately made any Loyal Man a Traitor, so this Minister's bare saying it is, must make any of the Fathers Works a *Forgery*.

The Council of Chalcedon *was clipt and abus'd, the Councils of* Laodicea, Gangræ *and* Carthage, *misrepresented.*

In my First Letter to you, Sir, I have cleared evidently these three Calumnies. The Case of the Council of *Carthage* is, whether these words in all the *Greek* Originals, Ὁ μάρτυρ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν εὔξεται, and all the *Latin* Translations, *Martyr oret pro nobis*, ought to be translated: *That the Martyr pray for us*, or as the Minister rendred it, *The Martyr will intercede to you for us.* This Second,

cond, I ſaid, and ſay ſtill, was a *Forgery*; and whoever can but Conſtrue *Greek* and *Latin*, will, I am ſure, ſay that I tranſlated right, and that the Miniſter was guilty of *Forgery*. I proved the Senſe I gave to a Canon of the Council of *Laodicea* to be the true one from *Theodoret*; That of the Council of *Gangra* from the very *Synodical* Epiſtle of that Council; That of *Carthage* was ſo evident, that the Miniſter having nothing to offer againſt it, thought fit only to ſay, without attempting the leaſt Proof, *All this is nothing to the purpoſe*: yet the *Preface-maker* will have them all *Forgeries*.

Had not this Miniſter great reaſon to conclude in his Preface, *He was amaz'd at ſuch a Maſs of Forgeries in ſo little room.* Theſe Gentlemen forget the Axiom, *Probationes habere debent qui accuſare volunt*; *They muſt have Proofs at hand that will accuſe.* I have, I conceive, fully made out in my Vindication, that *Proteſtant* Miniſters do accuſe our Writers of *Forgery*, but prove it not, and therefore ſtand guilty of the baſeſt ſort of *Calumny*, which hath as much of *Sillineſs* as of *Diſhoneſty*. Now I would make out the other Truth I aſſerted, to wit, that we prove upon them the moſt impudent *Forgeries* we accuſe them of, and this by an Inſtance the moſt weighty, in Dr. *Comber*'s Caſe; becauſe that no one ever pretended more to *Ingenuity*, *Sincerity* and *Charity*, and I boldly aſſert it, No one was ever guilty of ſo *many* and ſo *outragious* and *malicious Forgeries*. But becauſe this *Poſtſcript* ſwells already much beyond its due Bounds, to convince alſo Dr. *Sherlock*, that we do not generally forbid the reading of Heretical Books, but only to ſuch as want Abilities or Application, to ſearch into, and find out their groſs *Forgeries*, I will publiſh a Book written by a Lay-Gentleman, to whom I had recommended the Reading of the *Advice to Roman-Catholics*; by which it will appear how modeſtly I ſpoke, when I ſaid that Dr. *Comber*'s Forgeries and Falſifications could be produced by *Dozens*; for the Reader will find them expoſed by *Scores*, and ſuch as will allow of no Colour, but the Bluſhes of the hardeſt Forehead.

Lib. qui accuſare c. de edend.

Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam.

A Third Letter of F. Lewis Sabran *of the Society of* Jesus, *to Mr.* Needham, *Licenser of the Second Part of Dr.* Sherlock's Preservative *against* Popery; *Giving an account of the* Misrepresentations *and* Calumnies *that make up the whole Book.*

SIR,

WHILST my Second Letter to you is yet under the Press, I meet with a Second Part to the *Preservative* Licensed by you to come abroad; and because I apprehend, by a charitable Judgment, that you approve not all that you License, but (which of the two may be the lesser Fault) refer your self to the Author's Ingenuity and Accurateness, I venture once more to give you an account of the scandalous *Untruths*, and unconscionable *Forgeries*, in plain Matters of Fact, unto which you have unwarily put your Hand.

If *Reason* was much abused by the *First* Part of the *Preservative*, *Religion* is slandered at a far higher rate by the *Second*; in which the *Catholic Faith* appears so disfigured, that had I not consulted the Title, I had never discovered against what Church Dr. *Sherlock* directs his outragious Invectives. I laid open the Errors of the *First* in a single Sheet; a full Answer to the thredbare and weak Objections he hath made a Collection of in the *Second*, would not take up half a Sheet, if yet they could challenge at all to be considered: but he hath packt them up in so many slie and equally false Insinuations (which claim for him κατ' ἐξοχὴν, the Title of *The Misrepresenter*) and backt them with such a train of most shameless Calumnies, that the bare exposing of them (which is their plain Confutation) will I fear take up two or three Sheets. I will follow the order

order of his four *Sections*, and first summing up in each his Misrepresentations and Calumnies, I will give them no other Answer than by a fair and full account of our Faith; the ugly Mask he hath disfigured her by, will be no prejudice to her, when her Face appears.

Ten Misrepresentations and Calumnies contrived by Dr. Sherlock, *in his First Paragraph* Concerning Idolatry.

1. SAcrifice is the only Act of Worship which the Church of *Rome* appropriates to the Supreme God; she doth not pay to him alone that degree of Worship which the tempting Devil demanded of Christ, whereas our Saviour denying to give him this inferior degree of Worship, thereby teaches that no degree of Worship must be given to any Being but the Supreme God. *Preserv. fol.* 3.

2. The *Papists* by their worshipping Saints, Angels, and the Virgin *Mary*, put them in the Throne of God.

3. They offer not their Prayers only in the Name of Christ, that in him they may find acceptance. *Fol.* 4.

4. They make not their Applications to *One* God by *One* Mediator.

5. They bow *to* or *towards* their Images as the Objects of their Worship, and in that are Idolaters: So were not the *Jews* on account of the *Cherubins* which by God's Ordinance covered the *Mercy-seat*; for tho' the People, in pursuance of *David*'s Advice, did *bow down to, and worship God's Footstool*, and tho' this relate to the Ark, yet how doth *David*'s Exhortation to worship the *Ark*, which is God's *Footstool*, prove that all their Worship must be directed to the *Cherubins*, which are his *Throne*? Suppose the *Jews* were to direct their Worship towards the *Mercy-seat*, which was covered with the *Cherubins*, where God had promised to be present, how are the *Cherubins* concerned in this Worship, which was paid only to God as peculiarly present at that Place? which is no more than to lift up our Hands and Eyes to Heaven where the *Throne* of God is, when we pray to him, but the very Image (for Example, of Christ crucified) is the Object of the Worship of *Papists*. *Fol.* 9.

6. By the *Incarnation* God is visibly represented to us in our Nature; *Fol.* 12.

Fol. 13.

Nature; but the *Papiſts*, not contented with this, contrary to the Deſign of God made Man, make and adore other Images of God. 7. They have the Worſhip of Creatures and Images ſtill; and therefore all the viſible Idolatry that ever was practiſed in the World before. 8. They only change the Heathens Country-Gods into Saints and Angels, and give new Names to their Statues and Images. As to internal Notions, 9. The *Pagan* Philoſophers made the ſame Apologies for their Worſhip of Angels, and Dæmons, and Images, which the Learned *Papiſts* now make. And 10. 'Tis doubtful whether the Unlearned *Papiſts* have not as groſs Notions about their Worſhip of Saints and Images, as the Unlearned *Heathens* had.

The Faith and Practice of Catholics as to their Worſhip.

Qui confidunt in eis. *Pſ.* 133. Sacrificans diis Eradicabitur præterquam Domino Deo ſoli. *Exod.* 22.

THE *Catholic*, hating above all Sins the vain and abominable Idolatry of the *Heathens*, ſays *Amen* to that heavy Curſe of *David* on all thoſe *who put their truſt* in thoſe ſtrange and falſe Gods; for thoſe truly make a falſe God, not who carve his Idol, but who create him a Divinity in their Mind and Heart, by having recourſe to him by Prayers and Sacrifices, and what Sacrifice more valuable than that of the Heart, by a full return of confidence and dependence? He acknowledges no other Name to be invocated, no other Protection to be ſought, but of our Lord God thro' Chriſt in the Holy Ghoſt; That there is no other Name under the Heavens, in which we can attain Salvation; 'Tis God's Mercy, and his only he calls upon, from him only with the Prophet he ſeeks his Eternal Bliſs: So that he adheres to God alone, (*Pſal.* 84.) and places therein his Virtue and Comfort; That all his Prayers lift up his Heart towards God, fix his Hope on God, increaſe his Love of God: From him alone he ſeeks Relief in Want, Protection in Adverſity, Grace in Temptations, Security in Dangers, Virtue during Life, Victory in Death, Happineſs in Eternity.

Non eſt in alio aliquo ſalus, non enim eſt aliud nomen ſub cœlo datum hominibus in quo oporteat nos ſalvos fieri. *Act.* 4.

Oſtende nobis Domine miſericordiam tuam & ſalutare tuum da nobis. *Pſ.* 84.

nity. As he abhors that Saying of the Poet, *Each Mans Security is best placed in himself*; so with St. *Augustin*, he equally fears that Curse of the Prophet, *Be he accursed who confides in Man.* He owns with *Ezechiel*, that the Protection of *Noe*, *Daniel*, or *Jacob*, will not avail their wicked Children; and he places amongst them all those who put their trust not in their Creator but Creatures, not on God but their Fellow-Servants. He believes that each best Gift, each perfect Good, is from above, and issues from the Father of Lights; That whoever sweats under temporal Afflictions, and thirsts after ease and comfort; who ever sighs under spiritual Infirmities, and faints for want of relief; whatever our craving Hearts pant for, *Jesus* is ready by his Blessings to refresh us; and that since he shed his precious Blood for us on the Cross, 'tis our fault in not addressing our selves to him with confidence, if *Isay*'s Promise be not fulfilled in us, *You shall with joy draw abundant Waters* (of all Comforts) *from the Fountains of your Saviour* (his Wounds:) And therefore in all his Prayers he casts ever his Eyes *on Jesus the Author of his Faith, and the Perfecter of it*; it being the Essence of his Religion, that it fix his Thoughts, Hopes, Wishes, Prayers, and whole Soul on God. This all our Pulpits ever Preach, all our Universities and Divines teach, all our Catechisms explain, all our Books of Devotion move us to, all our Liturgies, public and private Prayers express. If we honor God's faithful Servants now glorious in his Presence, if we ask of them to joyn their Prayers to ours, 'tis God's Glory we aim at, and God's Mercy we sue for.

Aug. de Præd. SS. cap. 1.

Ezech. cap. 14.

Jacobi 1.

Joan. 7.

Isaiæ 12.

Quod uni Deo religemus animas nostras. *Aug. de verâ relig. cap. 55.*

All Divine Worship we pay to God alone, an inferior Worship we not only may, but must pay whereever it is due, as S. *Paul* commands us. The reason of it is, that all Worth and Dignity exacts a proportionable Value and Esteem, and having it interiorly, we ought to express it exteriorly, and such Expressions we call *Worship*, and those who may challenge it, *Worshipful*. If that Excellency and Worth be created and natural, as *Power*, *Greatness*, *Learning*, we call it Civil Worship; such is paid to Kings, Magistrates, Parents. If Divine and uncreated, we call it Divine Worship, or *Latria*, and pay it *to God alone*. If created, but supernatural, 'tis a *Religious Worship*;

Cui honorem, *Rom.* 13.

Ἡ τῶν ὁμοδούλων τιμή. *Hom. 26. de S. Mim. M.*

Worſhip, but ſuch as is paid to holy Fellow-Creatures, as St. *Baſil* obſerves: Such is paid to holy Places, as Churches; to holy Things, as the Sacraments; to holy Perſons, as Prophets, Prelates, Princes, living Saints, and with more reaſon, to thoſe who in Glory poſſeſs God; therefore, as St. *Auguſtin* obſerves, *We give them that Worſhip of Charity and Fellowſhip which we pay to Saints on Earth, but with as much greater a Devotion, as we are more certain of their Holineſs, now they are paſt all Dangers and Uncertainties, but with that Worſhip which in Greek is called* Latria, *which is a Servitude properly owed to the Divinity; we neither worſhip, nor teach to worſhip any one but God.* 'Tis falſe that Sacrifice is the *Only* Act of Worſhip which we appropriate to God; we appropriate to him all *poſitive* Prayer or Worſhip, and give none but *Relative*, or directed finally to God, to any Saint or Angel. It was a Calumny invented by *Fauſtus* the *Manichæan*, that we had exchanged the *Pagan* Idols for others, to wit, the Shrines of Saints. And St. *Auguſtin* having owned *Religious Solemnities* in honor of Saints, praiſes them, becauſe the Chriſtians then, (as Catholics now) by them only ſought *to excite themſelves to the Imitation of Saints, to be aſſociated to their Merits, and to be helped by their Prayers*, minding that Heretic, that Sacrifice is indeed the only Exterior Worſhip inſeparable from *Latria*, and therefore never to be offered to any but God; and therefore then (as now it is ſtill practiſed) no formal Invocation directed to any Saint, was uſed at Holy Maſs, but only Commemorations, *that they might Pray the more for us, the Chriſtians* (as St. *Gregory Nyſſen* obſerves) *calling on the Martyr as on God's Miniſter, who* being *Invocated* by Men, is able to Impetrate for them what Favors he pleaſes. That *Chriſt* by refuſing himſelf all Worſhip to God's Enemy the Devil, teaches *Us* to pay none at all to God's Saints and Angels, is an Inference that no one but Dr. *Sherlock* was ever capable to make. That to bring or invite Saints to the Feet of God's Throne, to joyn their Prayers to ours, is to ſet them in the Throne of God, is a Poſition that ſeems to be ſupported in ſpite of all Senſe and Reaſon. The Catholics by Petitioning the Saints to Pray to God for them, do moſt perfectly worſhip God, and that by as immediate a Prayer as the Three Children in the Furnace of *Babylon*,

Eo cultu dilectionis & ſocietatis, &c. *Lib.* 8. *de Civit. c.* 26.

Lib. 20. *c.* 21. *contra Fauſtum.*

Tract. 8. *in Joa. Serm.* 27. *de verb. Dom. l.* 22. *c.* 10. *de Civ. In S. Theod. Mar.*

Dan. 3.

Babylon, as *David* in his 148. Pſalm and others, where he invites all Creatures to Praiſe God; and whatever we admire in them being the Graces and Glory of God, and the Worſhip which they pay him, as directly leads to God as any other Prayer, the beſt ſort whereof is *Thanksgiving*, or a Memorial of the Bleſſings we have received our ſelves from God. Beſides, ſince we are ſure that they faithfully return to God as the Author of all that is praiſe-worthy in them, whatever Praiſes they receive from us, we honor and worſhip God more by Praying thus to them, than he that ſhould have held a Book of Prayers to St. *Peter* or St. *Paul* on Earth to read their Seraphical Prayers in.

The Catholic Believes there is but one God, and one Mediator between God and Men, the Man *Chriſt Jeſus*, as he believes there is *one Lawgiver and one Judge*, and *one Redeemer*: yet he believes that he who converts his Brother, ſaves his Soul, tho' Chriſt be the only Saviour, becauſe all other Means to Salvation have their efficacy from him. Chriſt is the only Mediator by Nature and his eſſential Office, by his own Merits only, challenging in Juſtice to be heard, having given *himſelf* a full Redemption: ſo that he is, as St. *Auguſtin* obſerves, *the Prieſt, who being now entred into the vail alone there of them who have been partakers of fleſh, doth make interceſſion for us*; yet, as the ſame Saint ſays, *without doubt the Martyrs intercede for us*. 'Tis true, we are bidden to *come with confidence to the throne of glory*, that is, with ſecurity that a full Ranſom is paid for us, of more than ſufficient value to obtain whatever we ask; but as the beloved Diſciple obſerves, that full confidence that they ſhall be heard, is only for thoſe *whoſe Heart doth not check them* with the conſciouſneſs of their Sins, and we reach not the Phariſaical Pride of thoſe who rank themſelves with the Innocents: We own Chriſt to be the Gate, the Way, he in whoſe Name we muſt ask; and we ſay with St. *Auguſtin*, *That Prayer which is not made in the Name of Chriſt, Mediator between God and Man, not only doth not blot out ſin, but is it ſelf a ſin*. We are certain, that whoever asks as he ſhould in the Name of Chriſt, will obtain what he asks; and therefore finding our Prayers ſo often not to be heard, and knowing that the very Prayer of a Sinner is odious to God whilſt his Sins crie louder,

Jac. 4, *Jac.* 5. *In Pſalm* 64. *In Pſalm* 85. *and* 88. 1 *Joan.* 3. *In Pſalm* 108.

we put that adorable Name in the Mouth of Saints, not by chooſing them for our *Mediators*, ſince their Prayers are of no other efficacy or value, but thro' the Paſſion of Chriſt; but for our Fellow-Interceſſors, as the Apoſtles themſelves, when on Earth, asked the Prayers of others, tho' abſent, by their Letters, and we as much apply the Mediation of Chriſt to us by the Prayers of our Fellow-Members of his Myſtical Body, as we do by Alms-deeds and other pious Works; which is no more a derogation to Chriſt, than that St. *Peter* ſhould work even greater Miracles than he himſelf, becauſe he wrought them in his Name; and we honor God as much as thoſe who laid their ſick Friends where St. *Peter*'s Shadow as he paſs'd might cover them, in lieu of calling immediately upon Chriſt, whoſe Devotion was approved by Miracles.

We pay no other Worſhip to Images than the *Jews* by the Holy Ghoſt's Commands paid to the *Ark* or *Mercy-ſeat*, or to the *Cherubins*: for whatever Dr. *Sherlock* ſays to the contrary, the ſame Worſhip may be paid to God's *Throne* as to his *Foot-ſtool*; the Images are not the Object of our Worſhip, but a Means to convey it to its proper Object, which they repreſent. We adore God *every where*, and particularly where his Repreſentative (as a Crucifix is of Chriſt) by a livelier Repreſentation renders him more preſent to our Faith, and we direct no other way our Worſhip towards a Crucifix, than we do towards Heaven, when we adore God there. We adore but one ſubſtantial Image of God, *Chriſt Jeſus*, but Pictures and Material Repreſentations no more than our own Thoughts, when in Contemplation we adore God, tho' we have a ſingular Veneration for them, (as we have for the Bible) proportion'd to that Civil Reſpect which we pay to the Images or Statues of our Kings. If our worſhip of Creatures be Idolatry, all the firſt Chriſtians were great Idolaters, who ſhewed ſo much Reſpect and Love to St. *Paul* and the other Apoſtles, and confided ſo much on their Prayers, which they asked with Tears: for we own and practiſe no other ſort of Creature-worſhip. That Catholics have every where, and even in this laſt Age, deſtroyed all Idols, and converted Nations from Idolatry, is a certain Truth; and therefore 'tis as evident a Calumny, that they have only changed the Names of Idols. The Heathen

then Philoſophers never pretended that their Prayers to Idols were only to ask *the Prayers* of Angels and Dæmons, not the leaſt footſtep of this appears in any one of them: and the Silver-Smith *Demetrius*, who accuſed St. *Paul* for teaching, that thoſe *were not Gods which were the work of mens hands*, ſufficiently teaches us what Notion was generally received of Idols. I have ſeen ſome part of the Catholic World, as *France*, the *Low-Countries*, ſome Parts of *Italy* and *Germany*; it hath been my great Employ to inſtruct the weakeſt Age, and dulleſt People; yet I profeſs I never met with any one that was in the leaſt danger to take a Picture or Statue for a God, or for a Saint that heard him: And the Inquiſitions, (againſt whoſe Severity *Proteſtants* ſo often declaim) tho' they have often detected thoſe who turned Jews, (a Perſuaſion moſt oppoſite to Image-Worſhip) yet never diſcovered any one, who by the uſe of Image or Statue, was fallen into Idolatry. We know God can hear us immediately, (and we commonly addreſs our Prayers immediately to him) ſo he can guard us without the help of Angels, and ſanctifie us immediately without the uſe of Sacraments; but he hath often declared, that he will have his Servants honored; and by *Ezechiel*, that he had ſought amongſt Men ſome one that would interpoſe betwixt his Anger and Sinners, and diſarm his Juſtice; and we look on the bleſſed Angels, Apoſtles, Martyrs, and other Saints, as thoſe whoſe Prayers God ſets betwixt us and his Juſtice, that his Mercy moved by the efficacious Blood of our *One* Mediator, may protect and bleſs us. This account doth, I conceive, ſufficiently diſcover the injurious Miſrepreſentations and Calumnies which Dr. *Sherlock* hath faſtned upon our Worſhip, under the odious Notion of Idolatry.

Act. 19. 26. Quoniam non ſunt dii qui manibus fiunt.

Cap. 14.

Six Miſrepreſentations and Calumnies contrived by Dr. Sherlock, *in his Second Section, concerning the Love and Mercy of God, and Pardon of Penitent Sinners.*

1. THE Church of *Rome* teaches, that Chriſt hath Redeemed us from Eternal, tho' not from Temporal *Fol.* 20.

Fol. 18, 19. Puniſhments. 2. That Men ſuffer in *Purgatory* when the Guilt of Sin is before taken away, and the Sinner is in a perfect State of Grace, and needs no Amendment; that is, for no Reaſon that make it either Good or Juſt for them to ſuffer.

Fol. 27. 3. That the Blood of Chriſt could not expiate for the Temporal Puniſhment of Sin, which the Merits of ſome Supererogating Saints, or the Pope's Indulgences, or the Prieſts Maſſes, can redeem us from: How then could that Blood make Expiation for Eternal Puniſhment? If his Intereſt in the Court of Heaven cannot do the leſs, how can it

Fol. 28, 29. do the great? 4. Again, the Church of *Rome* pretends, that Saints in Heaven Pray for us by way of *Intereſt* and *Merit*, not of *humble Supplication*. God indeed commanded us to Pray for one another, becauſe 'tis a mutual Exerciſe of Love and Charity, of Forgiveneſs of our Enemies, and of other Vertues; but this only becomes thoſe who live and converſe together

Fol. 30. in this World. 5. That Church takes the Virgin *Mary*, Angels and Saints, for Mediators, to incline God to be good to peculiar Perſons; whereas the Mediation of Chriſt was not to make God good and kind, (who before was infinitely good) but to reconcile God's Goodneſs with his Wiſdom and Juſtice, and to make it Wiſe and Juſt in God to do good to

Fol. 31. Sinners. 6. They believe Chriſt is not Merciful or Pitiful enough; That his Virgin Mother hath tenderer and ſofter Paſſions, and ſuch Intereſt with, or Power over him in the Right of a Mother, that ſhe can have any thing of him; And likewiſe they ſuppoſe other Saints to be much more Pitiful than he.

Dr. Sherlock's *Arguments againſt* Purgatory, *and our recourſe to Saints for their Prayers.*

Fol. 16. YOU may call the Doctrine of Purgatory *Juſtice*, you may call it *Vengeance*, but *Love* it is not. *I ſhould rather chuſe to fall into nothing when I die, than to endure a thouſand years Torments to be happy for ever.* 'Tis an extravagant Notion, That God may forgive Sins, and yet puniſh us for them.

Fol. 17. What is it Men deſire, when they deſire Pardon? Is it not that

that they may not be puniſhed? 'Tis *ſomething* that God exchange the Eternal Puniſhment due to Sin in Hell, for the Temporal of Purgatory; but would it not be a perfecter Expreſſion of Love and Goodneſs, to have remitted the Temporal Puniſhment alſo? The Texts that ſay that Chriſt *died for our ſins*, hath made *atonement for ſin*, is *a propitiation thro' faith in his blood*, if they do not ſignifie that a penitent Sinner ſhall be delivered from (all) the Puniſhment due to his Sins, how ſhall he be ſure, tho' his Sins are Pardoned, and he Juſtified, that he ſhall not be Damned for ever? Redemption *from the Curſe of the Law* cannot ſignifie that we ſhall not be *Eternally* puniſhed, unleſs it ſignifie that we ſhall not be puniſhed (at all,) and therefore not in Purgatory neither. There is no Threatning againſt Sin in all the Goſpel, but Eternal Death; all other Puniſhments are inflicted by virtue of this Law, conſequently he who is delivered from this Curſe of the Law, Eternal Puniſhment, is delivered from the *whole* Puniſhment due to Sin. 2 *Cor.* 4. 18. *The things which are ſeen* (that is of this World) *are temporal, but the things which are not ſeen* (that is of the next World) *are eternal*: This is a Demonſtration that there is no Purgatory. *Who believes in Chriſt, ſhall never die.* 11. *Joa.* 25. therefore good Men muſt not go to Purgatory, which is as much periſhing and dying as Hell, but not ſo long; otherwiſe Purgatory may be Everlaſting Life for all I know, and ſo the Pains of it Eternal. Could I believe our Saviour could leave his Members in Purgatory Fire, which burns as hot as Hell, I ſhould have mean thoughts of his Kindneſs, and not much relie on him for any thing; when a merciful Man cannot ſee a Beaſt in torment without relieving it.

Fol. 20, 21, 22. *Fol.* 24. *Fol.* 25. *Fol.* 26.

To imagin that we want any Mediator to God, but only our High-Prieſt, who Mediates in virtue of his Sacrifice, is a reproach to the Divine Goodneſs. God will never be perſuaded by any Interceſſion to ſhew Mercy to unfit Objects, that is, to Impenitent Sinners. *He that ſpared not his Son, but delivered him up for us all, how ſhall he not with him alſo freely give us all things?* It was not for want of Goodneſs, or that he needed Entreaties, that he gave his Son to be our Mediator.

Fol. 27. *Fol.* 28. *Fol.* 29.

Behold (not one omitted) all the Arguments which bear up the moſt outragious Declamations of this Man againſt the Church of God.

The

The Catholic Doctrin about Purgatory and Saints Interceſſion, and its evident Grounds oppoſed to Dr. Sherlock's *Sophiſtical Cavils.*

WE call the Doctrin of Purgatory, *God's Juſtice tempered with infinite Mercy*: And thô 'tis in our power, by the Mercy of God, to attain Salvation without ſuffering in Purgatory; yet we judge the Poſſeſſion of God ſo infinite a Good, that we believe that Man unworthy ever to ſee the Face of God, who declares with Dr. *Sherlock*, that did God offer him the Eternal poſſeſſion of himſelf on this Condition, that he ſhould firſt ſuffer a thouſand years, he would abſolutely refuſe it. We own two ſorts of Guilt in Sin; Firſt, an Averſion from God, and ſlighting of that infinite Good; Next, an Irregular Affection to ſome tranſient Good or Pleaſure, which the Prophet expreſſes by the forſaking the Fountain of living Waters, and ſeeking the leaking Ciſterns. To the Firſt is due, an Eternal loſs of God's Grace and Glory; to the Second, the Puniſhment of a ſenſible Pain. We believe, that thro' Chriſt we obtain full remiſſion of both Evils at once, whenever we are duely diſpoſed to receive it; to wit, when a perfect Contrition creates in us a full Converſion to God, and an equal deteſtation of all ſenſible Pleaſure, that may in the leaſt draw us from God. But when this Diſpoſition is but in a remiſs degree in us, God is yet ſo merciful, as thro' Chriſt to remit that firſt Guilt; and the Blood of Chriſt being particularly applied by the Sacrament of Penance, by the infuſion of his ſanctifying Grace, to make us his *Friends*, altho', becauſe we endeavor but weakly to be entirely ſuch, a ſenſible Pain remains due to us, to puniſh the paſt ſinful Pleaſure not ſufficiently mortified, either to be ſuffered by Penitential Works in this Life, or hereafter in Purgatory. A Man dying in the State of Grace indeed, but without a perfect Contrition, without ſupplying and increaſing it by the due Fruits of Penance, may be called ſtill, (and is ſo termed by St. *Hierom*) a Sinner, becauſe he carries with him to God's Tribunal, an Obligation of ſuffering for his Sins, which he hath refuſed, or hath not had

Hier in cap. 1. Nahum.

had time to comply with by a Penitential Life. In this Method of God's Judgments there appears but an unbiaſſed Juſtice, yet accompanied with a ſingular Mercy, by which God reſtores his Favor to us, before our Hearts be as perfectly converted as his Juſtice might well require. So God was merciful to the *Iſraelites*, when at *Moſes*'s Prayer he forgave them their paſt Sin of Idolatry, tho' as St. *Hierom* obſerves, he proteſted in his Juſtice, that he would puniſh that Sin in the day of revenge. Thus he was merciful to *David*, when *Nathan* acquainted him that *Our Lord had put away his Sin*, yet Juſt in puniſhing it by the death of his Child. Thus from the beginning he had been merciful to *Adam*, whom he *brought forth of his Sin*, yet how ſeverely he puniſhed him in his Juſtice, we know and feel in our ſelves yet the ſmart of it. 'Twas in contemplation of this Truth St. *Auguſtin* thus addreſſed himſelf to God, *Thou haſt loved Truth, that is, thou haſt not left unpuniſhed the Sins of thoſe thou haſt pardoned, ſo extending Mercy, as not to ſwerve from Truth and Equity.* For as St. *Baſil* teaches us, *altho' God hath in his only begotten Son granted to all, as much as in him lies, Remiſſion of Sin, yet becauſe Mercy and Judgment are joyned together, it is neceſſary that thoſe things which are ſpoken of Penance by the Prophets and Apoſtles, be performed in us, that the Judgments of the Divine Juſtice may be ſeen.* We own that the Blood of Chriſt cleanſes us from all Sins, but applied according to the Methods of a Juſt and Merciful Providence. Thus it cleanſes from all Guilt of, and releaſes all Puniſhment due to Sin, by the Waters of Baptiſm; and following Sins by the Tears of Penance, or if thoſe flow more ſparingly than God requires, by the Fire of Purgatory. Again, there are ſeveral Sins which unpardoned in this World, are pardoned, but after due Puniſhment, in the other. They make God ſevere indeed, and wonderfully blaſt his Mercy, who interpret that Sentence of God by *Ezechiel*, *The Soul which ſinneth ſhall die*, and that by St. *Paul*, *The wages of ſin is death*, of any the leaſt Offences, admitting of none venial in their nature, and ſay, *That without Faith and Repentance even the leaſt and lighteſt Sins are damnable and deadly.* We own that ſeveral lighter Sins bereave not a Soul of Grace and Juſtice, ſince that (*Prov.* 24.) *Seven times the juſt man falls and riſes again*; and as St. *John* witneſſes

Exod. 32. *Hier. Ep.* 12. *ad Gaud.*

2 *Reg.* 12.

Sap. 10.

Aug. in Pſ. 50. *Baſ. reg. brev. interr.* 12.

Ezech. cap. 18.

Ad Rom. 6.

Fulk in 1 *Ep. Joan.*

witneſſes of the moſt perfect, *If we ſhall ſay we have no ſin, we ſeduce our ſelves, and the truth is not in us. In many things we offend all*, ſays another Apoſtle, who teaches us, that beſides Concupiſcence which is no ſin, there is a conception of it which bringeth forth ſin; yet *that ſin only which is conſummated, engenders death.* They are then moſt injurious to God's Mercy, who own not that there is a degree of Knowledge and Conſent ſo imperfect, that tho' God is offended by it, yet the Band of Charity is not broken by it, but the fervor only of that Virtue is diminiſhed. Theſe Sins are purged by the Fire of Purgatory, this *Guilt* is puniſhed there. We hold then Purgatory Fire to be a purging Flame, which puniſhes Guilt: Of this the Prophet *Iſay* tells us, that *Our Lord ſhall purge the dregs of the daughter of Sion, and ſhall waſh the blood of Hieruſalem out of the midſt thereof, in the ſpirit of judgment and in the ſpirit of combuſtion.* And *Malachy, Our Lord is like a purging fire: He ſhall even refine the ſons of Levi, and purifie them as gold and ſilver.* Which words (ſays St. *Auguſtin*) *cannot ſignifie a ſeparation only of the polluted from the pure in the laſt penal Judgment, but muſt ſignifie a purgation of the good, who have need thereof:* whence in this firm belief he uſed the following Prayer: *Purge me in this Life, and make me ſuch an one as ſhall not need the amending fire.* Is it not a Poſition moſt ſuitable to the Mercy of God, by which we hold, that the Sacrifice of our Bleſſed Lord's Body and Bloud daily offered on our Altars, eaſes thoſe ſuffering Souls, and that God accepts of the Prayers of his faithful Servants offered for them; ſo that as St. *Peter Chryſologus* expreſſes it, *Souls redeemed* (from the Guilt and Eternal Puniſhment of Mortal Sins) *by the Grace of Chriſt, have remiſſion* (of leſſer Sins and Temporal Puniſhment) *obtained by the Interceſſion of the Church; and what the juſt Sentence of God would otherwiſe not have granted, the meritorious Prayers of the Church* (offering the Blood of Chriſt) *obtain it from God's Mercy, as a gratuit Gift.* Out of theſe Pains Chriſt after his holy Paſſion reſcued many, (*Act.* 2.) *whom God raiſed up, looſing the ſorrows of Hell.* On which words S. *Auguſtin* grounds the belief of the Church, *That the Soul of Chriſt did deſcend into the place where Sinners are puniſhed, to releaſe them of their Torments, whom he in his Juſtice thought worthy to be releaſed; otherwiſe* (adds the Holy Doctor)

I ſee

Joan. 1.
Jacob. 3.
Iſay 4.
Malach. 3.
Lib. 20. *c.* 25. *de Civit.*
In Pſalm 65.

Ut Chriſti gratiâ jam redempti ſanctæ Eccleſiæ interceſſione ſolvantur, & quod ſententia negat, Eccleſia mereatur, præſtet gratia. *S. Pet. Chryſol. Serm.* 125.

I ſee not how to expound that Text.—For neither Abraham *nor the poor Man in his Boſom, that is, in the ſecret of his quiet reſt, was reſtrained in Sorrows.* Sins then are truly puniſhed in Purgatory, and through the Grace of Chriſt are there remitted. Hence Chriſt could ſay of the Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, *That it ſhall not be forgiven in this world, nor in the world to come*; which could not be truly ſaid, as St. *Auguſtin* obſerves, *Except there were ſome, who altho' not in this World, yet in the next might be forgiven.* A Proof ſo often urged by the holy Doctor St. *Bernard*, againſt the Heretics of his time. Purgatory then is that Priſon, as *Tertullian* and St. *Cyprian* obſerve, into which many are caſt, when they are no more in the Way, and have been preſented to the Judge, till they pay the laſt Farthing, of which Chriſt ſpeaks. St. *Paul* teaches the *Corinthians* this Article of Faith, when beſide, that general Fire which goeth before the Face of the Lord in that Day *which ſhall be revealed by Fire*, and the Fiery Trial of Judgment it ſelf, *where the work of every one, of what kind it is the Fire ſhall try*, he aſſerts a third purging Fire, of which he ſays, *If any ones work burn, he ſhall ſuffer detriment, but himſelf ſhall be ſaved, yet as through Fire.* A Doctrin moſt ſuitable to God's Juſtice and Mercy: for ſays the often cited St. *Auguſtin*, *Why are ſome ſaid to be ſaved by Fire? Becauſe they build upon the Foundation* (of Faith and Charity) *Hay, Wood, Stubble; but if they would build Gold, Silver, and Precious Stones, they might be ſecure from both Fires; not only from that Everlaſting, which ſhall puniſh the Impious Eternally, but from that which ſhall AMEND them who ſhall be ſaved by Fire.—Who altho' they be ſaved by Fire, yet that Fire will be more painful and grievous than any thing that can be ſuffered in this Life*; not for want of Mercy in God, but becauſe he puniſhes Sin whereever he ſees it, as he eſſentially hates it. Yet Chriſt truly obtained remiſſion from all Temporal as well as Eternal Pain; whence, whoever is regenerated by Baptiſm, as the ſame Doctor obſerves, *he not only is not adjudged to Eternal Torments, but neither doth he ſuffer after Death any Purgatory Pains*, if he die in that State of recovered Innocency. Now I would know, whether God be leſs Merciful, becauſe *Ezechiel* puts this Sentence in his Mouth, *Lay her naked upon the Coals until her Braſs be heated,*

Lib. 12. de Gen. ad litt. cap. 33.

Matt. 12.

Ibid. l. 21. c. 24.

Lib. de anima c. 35. & 58.

Lib. 4. Ep. 2.

1 Cor. 3.

In Pſalm 37.

De Civit. Dei l. 21. c. 26.

Ezech. cap.

and

50 Homil. Hom. 16. *and all her Tin be fried out; because that* (says the same Doctor) *there idle Words, and wicked or impure Cogitations; there the multitude of lesser Sins, which have infested the Purity of her nobler Nature, shall seeth forth; there the Tin or Lead, which have obscured the Divine Image, shall be consumed; all which might here with Alms-deeds and Tears, after a more short and easie way, have been purged from the Soul.* Is it not just as St. *Gregory Nyssen* observes, *That all vicious Affections be purged either in this World by a sober course of Life, or after our departure hence by the Furnace of Purgatory Fire?* Is God not Merciful, because (Revel. 21.) *Nothing defiled can enter that Kingdom?* Was St. *Paul* injurious to the Mercy of Christ, when he chastised his Body, *to make up what was wanting in himself* (not in Christ) *of the Passions of Christ*; that is, such Dispositions as Gods Justice requires in us, that his Mercy through Christ may take effect? Those Sectaries, I am sure, of Dr. *Sherlock*'s Persuasion, who will not own any one Action of the Just to their very last gasp to be freed from Sin, are very injurious to Gods Justice, if those Sins are no where to be punished, with which they grant each Christian to go out of this Life.

Oratione ad Dom.

But those Punishments may last so long! That depends of us: let us but possess as perfect a Charity as God offers us, and by his holy Grace enables us to purchase, and we shall all avoid Purgatory. Thus a Martyr's perfect Charity sets him out of the reach of those Flames. As St. *Cyprian* observes, *One thing it is a long time punished for Trespasses to be amended and purged by Fire, and another to abolish all Faults by suffering for Christ.* No one suffers in Purgatory because God is not infinitely Merciful, but because he refuses to love that infinite Mercy as much as he ought, and God requires. 'Tis still (through Gods Mercy) in our power during Life, to shorten those Sufferings: For, as *Origen* warns us, *if any one bring a little Iniquity, that little Lead ought to be consumed by Fire; and if more heavy and leaden Metal, he is more burnt, that more may be wasted.* God were not Just if, as *Daniel* saw him, *a fiery and violent Flood did not run before his Face*, to consume and punish Sin. 'Tis by reason of our Sins, as St. *Augustin* observes, that *some shall pass through a fiery Lake, and horrible Shallows full of burning Flames, as much as shall remain of the Dross*

Lib. 4. Ep. 2.

Hom. 6. in Exod.

Dan. 7. 10.

Droſs of Sin, ſo long ſhall the delay of the Paſſage be. This Juſtice of God it is which made all holy Men ever to fear and tremble at the approaches of Death and Judgment, whilſt the very lewdeſt Livers amongſt Sectaries, grounded on the ſecurity of a prodigious Preſumption, if the Miniſter but tells them they have made their Peace with God, tho' in their whole Life they have never done that Penance for their Sins, without which the Word of God aſſures them, *they ſhall altogether periſh*; tho' perhaps they never ſhed a Tear for their Sins, tho' deſtitute of the help of the Sacraments, yet affront Gods Juſtice by a bold unconcerned Confidence, whilſt they preſume on a Mercy never promiſed to ſo undiſpoſed Souls. Different was the Senſe of the great Doctor St. *Hilary: Since no one* (ſays he) *appears ſpotleſs before God, how can we meet his Judgment with that hope and confidence, in which that unwearied Fire, and thoſe grievous Puniſhments are to be undergone, which Expiate a Soul from Sin.*

Cum nemo veniens in conſpectum ejus mundus ſit, quomodo deſiderabile ejus poteſt eſſe judicium—in quo ſubeunda ſunt gravia illa expiandæ à peccatis animæ ſupplicia.

That there remains then after the Guilt of Sin is forgiven, ſuch an Obligation to undergo Puniſhment, to paſs by all the *Greek* and *Latin* Fathers, all thoſe Texts of Scripture make it plain, which deliver unto us the neceſſity of Penance and its due Fruits. Now whoever goes out of this World, not having ſatisfied this Obligation, hath ſuch a moral unworthineſs, as bars him, till it be complied with, from the ſight of God. And thoſe who ſay, that it were a greater Mercy in God to remit all the Puniſhment due to Sin, blame Chriſt for Preaching Penance, and account him on that ſcore leſs merciful. To ſay with Dr. *Sherlock*, *That Men deſire nothing when they ask Pardon, but meerly not to be Puniſhed*, is to declare, they value not Gods Love and Grace like Children, but meerly fear the Laſh like Slaves; and all Catholics look on ſuch a Diſpoſition, excluding poſitively all regard to Gods Grace and Love, as incapable of receiving forgiveneſs of Sins. Chriſt hath made Atonement for our Sins, but his Blood is to be applied by Baptiſm, and in caſe of Relapſe, by perfect Contrition or Penitential Works during Life, or Puniſhment after Death, before all Pain due to Sin be remitted; thus applied, it frees us from the *whole Curſe of the Law.* No Suffering or

Puniſhment is the Death of the Soul, as Dr. *Sherlock* ſuppoſes, but only the privation of Gods Grace, which is her Life, and which is enjoyed through Chriſt as much in Purgatory as by penitent Saints on Earth in their penitential Sufferings; and the mercy of our Lord appears as much in purging his Members from all Stains of the leaſt ſin by the Fire of Purgatory, as here by the toilſom Labors of a penitential Life, ſuch as his deareſt Servants were ever purified by. St. *Paul* never taught, that *all things* that are not ſeen, or of another World, are Eternal, or elſe God would be Eternally Judging, and ſo never Rewarding his Servants, or Puniſhing his Enemies; ſo that Dr. *Sherlock*'s Demonſtration hath not ſo much as the leaſt appearance of a ſeeming Reaſon.

Enchirid. c. 10. Having thus repreſented our Faith, I conclude with *S. Auguſtin* againſt Dr. *Sherlock*; *It cannot be denied, but that the Souls of the Dead, are relieved by the Piety and Devotion of their living Friends, as often as the Sacrifice of our Mediator is offered, or Alms-deeds are done in the Church for them; but theſe things do bring profit only to thoſe, who in their Life-time did merit to receive profit by the like after Death: For there is a certain State of Life neither ſo good, that it needeth not theſe Helps after Death, nor ſo evil, but that it may be helped by the ſame.*

I have already Anſwered in the firſt Section, all thoſe Calumnies which are repeated here concerning the Bleſſed Saints Interceſſions for us. Our Doctrin, directly oppoſite to the ſlanderous Miſrepreſentations here offered, is, 1. We look on the Prayers of Saints as meerly *humble Supplications*; for we hold that Chriſt only *ſtandeth* our Mediator, challenging he alone in Juſtice, and by his own Merits, to be heard in favor of us. 2. We conceive Charity to be at leaſt as proper to, and inſeparable from the Seraphical Souls of Saints, as from any of Gods Servants on Earth, and as much inclining them to Pray for their Fellow-Members of Chriſt's Myſtical Body, engaged here below in Miſeries and Dangers. 3. We never required the Prayers of Saints, to render God good and merciful; but only when joyned with our Prayers, to render theſe a fitter Object of Gods Mercy, and to reconcile the Effects thereof to his Wiſdom and Juſtice. 4. Whatever pity the Saints may have on us, we look on it, as on a ſmall

Stilla ſitulæ.

Drop,

Drop, compared to the Ocean of Gods infinite Mercy; of which, that very Pity, and the Interceſſion of Saints, is a free Gift to us, given with all other Bleſſings, together *with*, and as an Effect *of* his greateſt Gift, to wit, his Eternal Son, with whom, in whom, and by whom, he hath given us all things. This Faith of ours doth, I conceive, moſt evidently expoſe the ſhameleſs Calumnies, which Dr. *Sherlock* hath disfigured her by.

Thirty Miſrepreſentations and Calumnies offered by Dr. Sherlock, *in his Third and Fourth Sections, and ſome of his Phanatical Principles.*

NEver did Man ſpeak more without Book, without Truth, and without any reſpect to Shame or Conſcience; this *Preſervative* deſerving more the Fate of defamatory Libels, than thoſe two which he priſes and recommends *Fol.* 78. No Narrative of the Miniſter *Oats* contains more Lies and Calumnies againſt the Perſons of Catholics, than the Miniſter *Sherlock*'s *Preſervative* againſt their Religion; the latter is infinitely more Impudent, becauſe he accuſes with an equally ſhameleſs Scurrility, not ſingle Perſons, but moſt Princes, Biſhops, Univerſities, Kingdoms of the Chriſtian World, and all the General Councils to boot. I do own, and will maintain it, That no man ever Lyed in Print with more Confidence, ever was ſo deafned by Paſſion to all the Reproaches of Conſcience and Honor: And had not a long Cuſtom of ſaying any thing in the Pulpit, tho' never ſo monſtrouſly falſe, that could render Catholic Religion odious, or ridicule it by diſfiguring it, dictated to his peeviſh Diſtemper this Second Part of his *Preſervative*, it would not, I conceive, have been poſſible, that all the Gall that can drop from a Chriſtians Pen, ſhould in one Pamphlet have heaped ſo many and ſo defamatory Calumnies. Take the following Inſtances.

Provincial Letters, Jeſuits Morals, burnt by the Hangman.

1. *The Catholics by unwritten Traditions, that make up a part of their Rule of Faith, mean ſuch things as may be concealed from the knowledge of the World for* 1500 *Years, never heard of before in the Church of God, kept very privately and ſecretly for ſeveral Ages,* Fol. 73, 74, 75.

Ages, and totally unwritten. By Tradition we mean a Revelation received from God, by the Apoſtles, conveighed by the continual teaching and preaching of Lawful Paſtors, ſtrengthned by the viſible practice of Chriſtian Churches; found in the Books of ſucceeding Fathers and Hiſtorians, though not in Canonical Scripture, which St. *Paul* recommended to *Timothy* faithfully to be kept as a *depoſitum.* And commanded the *Theſſalonians* to obſerve, which if it be laid by, ſays St. *Baſil, We ſhall retain of the Preaching of the Faith, but an empty Name:* and which is delivered to us as Preached by the Apoſtles by the ſame means, and with the ſame ſecurity at leaſt, as the Letter of the Goſpel is conveighed to us, as written by them.

1 *Tim.* 6. 2 *Theſ.* 2. de Sp. S. c. 27. Ipſam fidei prædicationem ad nudum nomen Contrahemus.

Fol. 79. 2. *They teach ſeveral External Obſervances, to be much more pleaſing to God, and therefore much better in themſelves, than true Goſpel Obedience, Moral or Evangelical* virtues: *that they ſupply the want of true virtue, Compenſate for ſin, and make men great Saints.* We teach that Gods inherent Grace only Sanctifies us, and that whatever External obſervance void of Evangelical virtue, is a ſinful Hypocriſie, and only can make one a greater ſinner.

Fol. 81, 82. 3. *They teach that when a Prieſt Abſolves men, that forſake not their ſins, God muſt confirm the Sentence of his Miniſter, and therefore they are Abſolved and need not fear; whence they believe that God can be reconciled to ſinners, whilſt they remain in their ſins. And therefore they muſt believe that God hath given power to his Prieſts to Abſolve thoſe whom he could not Abſolve himſelf.* We teach that to receive Abſolution without a real forſaking of our ſins, in lieu of forgivneſs of them, adds a hainous Sacrilege.

Fol. 90. 4. *In the Church of* Rome *men may Expiate their ſins by Penances, but are under no neceſſity of forſaking them.* No pain due to ſin can be remitted whilſt the guilt remains, nor this removed till they be forſaken: no Exterior Penance can in the leaſt Expiate the guilt of ſin. This is our Doctrin by which the Calumnies of the following Miſrepreſentations appear.

5. *They*

5. *They account Satisfactory works, Faſtings, acts of Penance, Prayers, Alms, though done without the leaſt ſorrow for ſin, without any true Devotion to God, without mortifying any one Luſt: mere External Rites and Obſervances, being judged Satisfactions and Expiations for Sin.* Fol. 45, 46.

6. *They uſe External Mortifications to ſatisfie for ſins, not to kill them by ſubduing the Fleſh to the Spirit; to puniſh themſelves for ſins, that they may commit them more ſecurely again.* Fol. 91.

7. *The* Roman *Church teaches, that men need take no care of Venial ſins, and that they may keep clear from mortal ſin without any great attainment in virtue.* It teaches a voluntary Venial ſin ought not to be committed, to ſave a whole Worlds Lives: that it diſpoſes to Mortal ſins as Diſeaſes do to Death: that if our Paſſions be not curb'd by the practice of ſolid Chriſtian Virtues, mortal ſins will not be avoided, nor Heaven attained, which they only purchaſe who uſe Violence. Fol. 79.

8. *In the* Roman *Church Mony is paid for Indulgences, and with them Satisfactions and Merits are bought.* To pretend to buy or ſell any ſuch Spiritual things, we account a moſt grievous ſin. And every Alms-giver might with as much Juſtice be accuſed, to have bought of God, his Grace and Pardon for a ſum of Mony. Fol. 45. 48.

9. *They Conſecrate ſenſeleſs things to pardon Venial, or ſometimes Mortal ſin, by touching or kiſſing them.* Fol. 44.

10. *They attribute Divine Virtues and Powers to ſenſeleſs things; as is evident from the honor paid to Relicts: and from the Conſecration of* Agnus Dei's, *Wax Candles, Oyls, Bells, Croſſes, Aſhes, Holy-Water.* Fol. 43.

11. *With them ſenſeleſs things are capable of the Sanctification of Gods holy Spirit by his Graces, and can convey ſuch Sanctification by Divine and inviſible effluviums of Grace.* All theſe are miſrepreſentations of our Faith which teaches us nothing of all this. What we believe is, that nothing can free us from the guilt of any ſin, which is external, and doth not effect and change the heart. That *all Creatures of God are good,* and that *they are Sanctified by the word of God and Prayer*; neither doth Faith teach us that any Material thing hath any other than Moral Connexion with Grace, either obtain'd for us by the Prayers of the Church, offered for us at the bleſſing Fol. 44. 1 *Tim.* 4.

of

of those things, or of those blessed Saints whom we honor, and call upon by that Veneration, or by the Sacraments according to the Institution or Covenant of Christ; but we do not believe that Gods Grace is inherent, but in the Souls of the Faithful, or that any sin is remitted without a due disposition in a repentent sinner. Or any virtue to be now-a-days Communicated otherwise by insensible things, than it was to the Woman that touched the Hem of Christs Garments, or by the Handkerchiefs of St. *Paul*, or Shadow of St. *Peter*. Neither do we use any Blessings which we do not find in the Records of the Primitive Church, to have been ordered by the Apostles: as I am ready to make out when ever required.

Fol. 39. 12. *The* Popish *Ceremonies are more severe and Intollerable than the* Jewish *Yoke it self, which St.* Peter *tells the* Jews, *neither they, nor their Fathers were able to bear.* Unless he means it intollerable to Christians to Fast in *Lent*, in imitation of our Blessed Lord, and *Friday* and *Saturday* in memory of his bitter Agony on the Cross, and laying in the Grave for us, or their obligation of praying to God daily, and particularly the Lords day, and of relieving the necessities of the Poor: thus calling Fasting, Watching, Praying, and Alms-deeds so recommended by Christ our Lord, *Mere Ceremonies*: I know no Obligations imposed on the generality of Christians by any positive Law of the Church, which can be called a Yoke. As for the Ceremonies used in the Liturgy, if they be a burden, sure the Clergy or Religious, must feel the weight of them, yet I am sure not one ever owned it, but this predominant passion of Calumniating will venture blindly at the most shameless untruths.

Fol. 40, 41. 13. *Their Canonical Fast is not to abstain from Food, but only from such Meats as are forbidden.* This is most false, but one Meal being allowed of on Fasting-days.

Fol. 41. 14. *There is no imaginable reason why it should be an act of Religion meerly not to abstain from Flesh, if Flesh have no legal uncleanness.* Here he would insinuate that we Judaize. But when God by *Hyeremy* praised the *Rhechabites* for abstaining from Wine, was it because Wine was held by them to have a legal uncleanness? Is the taming of the Flesh, the curbing of Sensuality, no reason at all for Abstinence?

15. *They*

15. *They may Faſt and ſay over their Beads and perform their Penances and Satisfactions by another as well as if they did it by themſelves.* This is an Impudent Sham. Each man is bound to ſatisfie by himſelf, fulfilling the Penances impoſed upon him. Fol. 43.

16. *They hold that they have no title to Reward by doing their Duty, and therefore they add Works of Supererogation.* A ſhameleſs untruth! Nay, the more preſſing the Duty is, the greater the Reward; Alms given to a man ſtarving for hunger, we hold more meritorious, than if not ſo great a neceſſity bore off the obligation of relieving him. Each neceſſary obſervance of the Commandments hath a Crown laid up, to be render'd by the juſt Judge. Fol. 47.

17. *Whilſt they Pray in an unknown Tongue, a* Parrot *may as much be taught to Pray in Spirit as they.* He would inſinuate that Catholics when they aſſiſt to Prayers which they do not underſtand, are not Commanded to pray in Spirit by devout thoughts and pious affections, which is a mere Calumny. Fol. 58.

18. *They take no care to inſtruct men in all neceſſary Doctrins; they learn their Creed as School-boys their Grammar, without underſtanding it: they receive the Impreſſion that is made on them as Wax doth, and underſtand no more of the Matter. And with them this is the utmoſt perfection of Knowledge that any Chriſtian muſt aim at.* A heavy Charge, but ſo perfect a Slander, that beſides the Obligation laid on all thoſe that have the charge and Cure of Souls; hundreds of thouſands of Religious men, make it their daily Employ to inſtruct the Ignorant, and each Pariſh hath Schools of Chriſtian Doctrin to that end: ſo that uſually Children of ten years old can give a better account of their Faith in Catholic Countries, than Sectaries of forty years old can generally do, who have ſeldom heard of any thing in the Concerns of Religion, but Slanders and Miſrepreſentations of Catholic Doctrin. It hath been my Lot to deal for ſome time with a Body of near two hundred *Proteſtants* on the ſcore of Religion, and I in truth Proteſt, that I found not one in ſix that could give me any reaſonable account of Chriſt being God and Man, and dying for our Redemption. We exact of each Chriſtian that to the beſt of Fol. 61.

his abilities he improve his knowledge in the duties of Faith.

Fol. 76. 19. *They teach a man need not know any thing but the Apoſtles Creed: therefore Heretics know and believe all things neceſſary to Salvation, as long as they believe the Apoſtles Creed. Did Chriſt teach any thing but what he would have known?* We teach that each Chriſtian is bound to know all that he is bound to do, and to underſtand all thoſe neceſſary means left by Chriſt for his Reconciliation and Perfection, though not expreſſed in the Creed: we teach that *each Man* is not bound to know all that Chriſt hath taught, but yet all that Chriſt has taught as neceſſary to him in his Station. But this Calumniator confounds what is to be known *neceſſitate Medii*; ſo that he who through no fault of his hath not learn'd it, is however uncapable of Salvation: (which is all contained in the Creed) with what muſt be known, *Neceſſitate Præcepti*; becauſe God hath commanded all thoſe who are in the occaſion, and in a capacity of being inſtructed in it, to learn it.

Fol. 82, 83. 20. *The Church of* Rome *teaches, that the ſins of thoſe ſinners who do not repent of them, nor amend their lives, and conſequently are not Expiated by the Death of Chriſt upon the Croſs, are Expiated by the Sacrifice of the Maſs.*

Fol. 83. 21. *That by the bare* opus operatum, *by the offering this Sacrifice of the Maſs it ſelf, without any good motion in the Perſon for whom 'tis offered, his ſins are Expiated.*

Fol. 85. 22. *That when Chriſt was Sacrificed upon the Croſs, he Expiated only for the Eternal Puniſhment due to ſin; and when Sacrificed in the Maſs, only for the Temporal.* Behold three loud Calumnies! We teach that Chriſt on the Croſs gave himſelf a full Redemption for all the Guilt and Debt of Sinners, who apply to themſelves that precious Blood, by the means appointed by Chriſt. That by the Sacrifice of the Maſs, as alſo by any good Chriſtians Prayers for obdurat ſinners, ſuch Graces may be obtained, as ſhall work in them their Salvation: but that no ſin is remitted to an impenitent ſinner. And all we mean by *opus operatum*, hath no reference to him who receives the Sacraments, to the whole effect whereof a ſtubborn and unconverted ſinner puts ever a full ſtop: but in reference to thoſe who Adminiſter the Sacraments, from whoſe

Piety

Piety they take not their force; Baptiſm given by a Prieſt in the ſtate of ſin, having as much its whole effect as given by a Saint, becauſe it takes its value and force from Chriſt the chiefeſt Miniſter in the conferring of it: ſo the Church did teach by St. *Auguſtin* heretofore, againſt *Parmenian* the Heretic, ſo She teaches to this day.

23. *Catholics think that the Interceſſion of the Virgin* Mary, *or the moſt Powerful Saints can prevail with our Saviour to do that which according to the Laws of his own Mediation, they know he cannot, and will not do; How can any man be ſo ſtupid as to think this? Yet ſo it is.* A bare-face Calumny. For we teach that the bleſſed Saints, only join their Prayers to ours, to obtain of Chriſt for us, what he in his mercy will have them to ask: it being a moſt proper effect of Chriſt's Mediation, to challenge Bleſſings for ſeveral Members of his Myſtical Body on the account of the whole, or moved by the love he bears to the holier Members thereof; ſince he hath declared that many joining together to Petition in his Name, will obtain Bleſſings, which had not been granted to the ſingle Prayers of ſome one. *Fol.* 87.

24, 25, 26. *By the Doctrin of Purgatory, they mightily abate the terror of Hell, conſidering how many eaſie ways there are for rich Men to get out of Purgatory, who have Mony enough to buy Indulgences while they live: or Maſſes for their Souls.* Here are three Calumnies that lie thick together. The firſt, that Catholics exempt ſinners from Hell, who in the *Proteſtant* Doctrin would be Condemned to it. No unrepented Mortal ſin is lodged in Purgatory, or eſcapes Hell. Secondly, That Indulgences may be bought for Mony, or avail a Soul undiſpoſed to receive the benefit of them, through want of Contrition, the guilt of ſin not being before remitted. The Third, that Maſſes ſaid for any Soul in Purgatory, avail ſuch as during life have not deſerved and merited that mercy; which untruth I have before defeated, with the words of St. *Auguſtin*, delivering our Faith in the 110. Chapter of his *Enchiridion* to *Laurence*. *Fol.* 87, 88.

27, 28, 29. *The Sacrament of the Lords Supper, beſides the ſupernatural conveyance of Grace, is a great Moral inſtrument to Holineſs, repreſenting to us the love of our Crucified Lord, the* *Fol.* 91.

merit and deſert of ſin, requiring the Exerciſes of a great many virtues, &c. *But in the Church of* Rome *this Sacrament is turned into a dumb Shew, which no body can be edified with, or into a Sacrifice which Expiates ſins, and ſerves us inſtead of a holy life.* Behold three crying Calumnies! The *Firſt*, that amongſt us there is no other uſe of the Sacrament of our Lords Supper but for a *Shew*, or a *Sacrifice*, whereas that holy Sacrament is received by all pious Catholics at leaſt once a Month; and by an Infinity once or oftner each week, by our Prieſt daily. The *Second*, that we require no practice of any Virtue: whereas we interpret the words of St. *Paul*, *Let a man try himſelf*, of the Sacrament of Penance, in which we exact a true ſorrow for paſt ſins, a firm purpoſe to dye rather than to fall into any other again: a full ſatisfaction to all the perſons we have injured in their Reputations or Fortunes, or any other way, a perfect entire reconciliation with our Enemies, a removal of all the occaſions that lead us into our former ſins, or may likely prove a ſtumbling Block for the future: a breaking and ſubduing of our Paſſions by penitential works, Devotion towards the admirable Myſtery of our Redemption, humility in accuſing our ſelves of our moſt ſecret ſins, a firm hope of Remiſſion, *&c.* But theſe things are with Dr. *Sherlock*, no Chriſtian Virtues. A *Third*, that our expoſing of the bleſſed Sacrament is a dumb ſhew, and that ſo we aſſiſt at Holy Maſs; we hold no neceſſity of a Pious life: whereas we feel that nothing ſpeaks more the Mercies of God; nothing moves us more to Chriſtian Virtues, than this great Sacrament conſidered with the Eyes of Faith: and believe that this Sacrifice helps much to a holy life, but not at all without it.

30. *Amongſt them one can Merit for twenty, ſo there is no need above one in twenty ſhould be Good.* Merit with us is Perſonal, and not Communicative; no one is better in the ſight of God for the Piety of another: and in what ever ſenſe one may ſatisfie Gods Juſtice for the Penitential works he exacts from an other whoſe ſin is remitted, no one hath a title to the leaſt degree of Glory, and conſequently hath any Merit by an others Sanctity, or Merit.

Many more of this Man's Calumnies I paſs by; theſe Thirty and the other Ten I have laid down, being a clear Evidence, that he is the moſt confident Calumniator that ever Preached or Writ; who dares ſay any thing without the leaſt reſpect to Truth, without any regard to Charity, Honor or Conſcience. Now, Sir, give me leave to offer you ſome few of the many Fanatical Principles he advances, as deſtructive to what you call your Church, as to Chriſtianity in general; that in your ſecond thoughts you may bluſh (if you are capable of it) for having ſet your Name to them, and Licenſed them to the Preſs.

The Firſt. *God being a Spirit, muſt not be ſought for in Houſes of Wood and Stone; becauſe he muſt be worſhipped in Spirit, he muſt not be worſhipped by any material or ſenſible Repreſentations. Thoſe words, Except your Righteouſneſs exceeds the Righteouſneſs of the Scribes and Phariſees, you ſhall in no wiſe enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, cuts off every thing that is External in Religion.* Do not theſe Principles remit all Chriſtians to the *Silent Meetings* of *Quakers*? Exclude the uſe of Churches rather than Barns; Singing of Pſalms, and ſuch other material Repreſentations of the God whom we Praiſe? Fol. 48, 50, 51. Fol. 38.

The Second. *God and Chriſt are not preſent in the Aſſemblies of Chriſtians by any Figurative or Symbolical Preſence: There is no Symbolical Preſence of God under the Goſpel. 'Tis a great Abſurdity to talk of more Symbolical Preſences of God than one: for a Symbolical Preſence confines the unlimited Preſence of God to a certain Place in order to certain Ends; as for Example, to receive the Worſhip which is paid him. Now to have more than one ſuch Preſence as theſe, is like having more Gods than one.* To ſay nothing of the abſurdity of this Diſcourſe, which makes that Chriſtian an adorer of two Gods, who by Faith adoring God in Heaven and in his own Soul, worſhips him in both places; doth not this deſtroy the very Eſſence of your Sacrament, the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper, which you own to be a Symbolical Preſence of Chriſt? Fol. 37. Fol. 34, 55.

The Third. *If God be better worſhipped before an Image than without one, then the Worſhip of God is more confined to that Place where the Image is. I cannot ſee how to avoid this; whereas there is no appropriate Place of Worſhip under the Goſpel: And 'tis the* Fol. 53, 54.

ſame

ſame, tho' the Image be not appropriated to any Place, but carried about with us; for ſtill the Image makes the Place of Worſhip. This is an Argument for all Diſſenters from you, and all Fanatics againſt a *Set Liturgy*, a *Set Form of Prayer*: for if God be better worſhipped by a Set Form of Prayer than without it, then the Worſhip of God is more confined to that Place where that Set Form of Prayer, that Set Liturgy is uſed; and 'tis the ſame, tho' no ſet Place be appointed for that Set Form of Prayer, *&c.* The Parallel is exact.

Fol. 34, 36. The *Fourth.* Having laid this Principle, *All that is meerly External in Religion, is taken away, all Rites believed to be in themſelves Acts of Religion, and to render the Worſhipper acceptable to God; and this becauſe God muſt be worſhipped as a meer Spirit.* To defend the uſe of *Baptiſm* and the Lord's Supper, he brings this only Reaſon: *Mankind by Sin hath forfeited all natural Right to Gods Favor, they can challenge nothing but by Promiſe and Covenant, ſuch Covenants require a mutual Stipulation on both Sides; Therefore they muſt be tranſacted by ſome viſible and ſenſible Rites, whereby God obliges himſelf to us, and we to him.* Is not this laſt Inference deſtroyed by the former Principle, taking away all *Rites* that are Acts of Religion, all that is meerly External? And on this Principle ought he not to teach, that the mutual Stipulation betwixt God and us, muſt be made by his interior Graces, and our interior Worſhip, becauſe God muſt be worſhipped as a meer Spirit? Upon whatever account that interior Covenant requires a viſible ſenſible Mark, and our actual Communion with Chriſt another, all the Communications of Gods Graces to us, all our return of Worſhip and Adoration will equally admit of ſenſible Signs and Rites. To avoid farther Prolixity, I will end with the following Principle of his, moſt injurious to Chriſt, and an open and never to be coloured Blaſphemy.

Fol. 68, 69, 70. Fifth Principle. *There never was, never can be an Infallible Judge; Chriſt himſelf was not an Infallible Judge, altho' he were an Infallible Teacher. I muſt my ſelf judge of his Doctrin, before I know that he is Infallible; therefore Men were to judge of Chriſt's Doctrin, before they believed him; and they are thus to this day to Examin his Doctrin by the Law and Prophets, and he never required that they ſhould ſubmit to his Infallible Authority*

without

without Examination. He could not be an Infallible Judge, obliging Men to receive all his Dictates as Divine Oracles, without Examination: 'Twas impoſſible to know him to be Infallible, but by judging of his Doctrin, by the agreement thereof with the Principles of Reaſon, and of former Revelations. Doth a Chriſtian teach this, and a Chriſtian approve and licenſe it! What, *JESUS* our God bleſſed for evermore, even when owned the Son of God, even from us Chriſtians, cannot exact a Submiſſion to his Infallible Authority, without Examination of the truth of what he ſays, by comparing it with the Principles of Human Reaſon! He cannot oblige us to receive all his Dictates as Divine Oracles! Was Chriſtian Faith, was the Author of it *JESUS*, ever thus affronted! Did the Apoſtles err, did they act againſt Senſe and Reaſon, when they believed what he had taught, of his Fleſh *being meat indeed*, only becauſe he *had the words of Eternal Life*, becauſe his Dictates were Divine Oracles? Were all men of this mind, Chriſt would not indeed find any Faith on Earth. What tho' we certainly know Chriſt to have taught and declared a Truth, muſt we not upon his word ſubmit to it and embrace it, till we have conſulted our Reaſon, and found it can object nothing againſt it? Were the weapons of S. *Paul*'s warfare ſuch as *could humble what raiſed it ſelf againſt the ſcience of God, and bring into captivity all underſtanding in obedience to Chriſt*, and had the Word and Preaching of Chriſt leſs power? *Chriſt teaches it* is not yet a ſufficient Motive for me to believe? Should an Angel from Heaven teach me this, I would with St. *Paul* return him no other Anſwer than *Anathema*; and do you, Sir, approve this? Do you Licenſe men to teach to Chriſtians, they are not to ſubmit to Chriſt's Word as to Divine Oracles; that they muſt make themſelves his Judges, and Examin by their Reaſon, whether he ſpoke truth or no? Well, Sir, were it but not to give occaſion to the ſpreading ſo horrid Blaſphemies againſt our Lord and God, I take my leave of you, and of ſuch Books Licenſed by you; and end with this Profeſſion of my Catholic Faith: *Chriſt is an Infallible Judge, I muſt not Judge of his Doctrin, but believe it, and ſubmit to him; I ſubmit to his Infallible Authority without Examination; I receive all his Dictates as Divine Oracles.* If, tho'

Joh. 6. v. 69.

2 Cor. 10. 5.

tho' Summoned by me, you ſtill refuſe to Subſcribe to this Doctrin, I will obey St. *John*'s Counſel, I will have nothing to do with you nor return to you ſo much as *Ave*, or any Greeting; but content my ſelf with Subſcribing to this Profeſſion of my Faith,

LEWIS SABRAN

Of the Society of

JESUS.